

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXII, No. 9. SEPTEMBER 1942

ANOTHER EXPERIMENT IN CO-OPERATION

MANY men, many minds ; many study-groups, many differing experiences. Our own experiences differ so much from those recorded by "K. T. L." in last month's issue of THE CLERGY REVIEW that I feel urged to place them before the brethren. Only by pooling the happenings in various centres can we hope to make much progress in the movement. Maybe a hint or two here, and a hint or two there, may help others to avoid an odd pitfall.

We are a small township of some 70,000 folk, on the outskirts of a city of 250,000 inhabitants. People visiting would wonder why the two entities still retain their individualities. Yet to those living in the district there is no mystery. The smaller town is much older and more compact than its big neighbour ; the habits of its people, the outlook of its leaders, quite different from those of the city. It was in the city that the first movement was made. The Anglican rector invited the parish priest and the senior Nonconformist minister to a talk about the Ten Points. After some discussion it was felt that it would be much better if the smaller borough could be brought in for consultation, and perhaps for common action. Each party to the meeting was empowered to invite his opposite number. This was done.

On the date appointed we all presented ourselves at the meeting-place. The feasibility of the matter was discussed at great length, and finally it was decided to begin with a huge meeting in the largest hall in the district. Three speakers were to be selected—a Catholic, an Anglican, and a Nonconformist. We plumped for our Ordinary ; the Church of England for their bishop, and the Nonconformists for a very prominent speaker who for the nonce happened to be residing in the district. There was to be no charge for entrance, but seats could be reserved in the galleries and upon the platform at a small charge. It was hoped to cover expenses in this manner. Tickets were divided equally between the bodies promoting the assembly ; the matter was well advertised, and on the Sunday afternoon the hall was packed.

The Chairman, one of the local M.P.s, taking his cue from the Stoll Theatre meetings, opened the proceedings with the Our Father. At the conclusion of the prayer he introduced the subject, and called upon the first speaker, who was the Anglican bishop. At the conclusion of His Lordship's speech, our Ordinary commenced. His first act was to suggest that in future we should pray silently. It reminded one of St. Margaret Clithero. He explained that the Catholic idea in joining with non-Catholics was to form a united front against the prevailing secularism, but that object

gave no sort of countenance to the notion that we would join in prayers or religious objects. He suggested that if prayer was desired at our meetings, there should only be silent prayer. Thus was forestalled a difficulty which might otherwise have caused dissension. We started correctly from the beginning, largely because of this lead. The Nonconformist speaker followed the Catholic lead, stressing that there was no need to consider that anyone gave up one jot or tittle of his religious beliefs. He urged all to combine for the great object. The meeting ended—after silent prayer—on a note of high optimism.

All three speeches were excellent, yet left one a trifle disappointed because the precise point selected for each speaker was not completely adopted. I suppose busy men cannot always conform with requirements. The matter of our Ordinary's speech was admirable, as all simple things are admirable. It could be reduced to the startling answer to the catechism question, "Why did God make you?"

At the beginning of the meeting cards were placed on each chair. Those who desired to take part in the work were asked to sign them, and hand them in before they left the hall, or post them to the Secretary. The religion of the applicant, as well as his address, was noted, and in due course the cards were sent to the district secretaries. Rather more than 600 cards were signed and returned.

A meeting of clergy and ministers was held shortly afterwards to consider the matter for the first study. The Ten Points were each in turn examined. Finally, at the suggestion of one of the priests, the third of the Archbishop's standards was chosen as the most immediate appeal-maker. It was felt that the Christian concept of Marriage and the Family has been so largely jettisoned, and the need to recover that cardinal element in reconstruction is so essential, that a study of the third point was the immediate prerequisite to any fruitful effort. So far so good. Now came the crux. What books were we to choose for study? Obviously, unless we could secure uniformity in the matter of text-book, we should never get very far. There must be some kind of limit to the period which should elapse between the commencement and completion of the subject. Here there was wide diversity of opinion. No one seemed to have anything worked out. Finally we suggested the *Sword of the Spirit Notes* for Discussion. They were immediately produced by the proposer, examined carefully and accepted unanimously. There has never been the slightest evidence of a desire to change the books. We started therefore with No. III: *The Family*.

Nine study clubs were formed immediately. Of these—though in principle all are open clubs—three are predominantly Catholic. One of these is ours. Four are predominantly Church of England and Nonconformist combined. In two places all denominations meet together. Since the beginning two more Catholic clubs have commenced. Not merely does the complexion of the clubs vary, but the methods differ. In some localities it is found easy to get the students to talk and to give the advantage

of their own ideas to the club. In others not so easy. One club or group will have a single leader, others have a panel from which to draw. The second method is of course easier for everyone concerned; it parcels out the labour; it redoubles the interest of the members, so they say. On the other hand, some find that a single leader ensures greater continuity of treatment. In one group the students take up a large part of the time of study with questions; in another the leader will give his lecture, and the students take their notes, seldom asking questions publicly. Punctuality is a very important matter—punctuality both in commencing and ending. We find in our club that one hour is sufficient. We start at 8 p.m. and finish, no matter what the questions are, at 9 p.m. sharp. The students can remain if they will to discuss privately, but the “Actiones” having been said, the group breaks up. This is a very important matter. Some have allowed the time to be frittered away, and have caused not a little annoyance by protracting the session.

A great deal of good is done by the Catholic Evidence Guild, which directs a member to attend the four groups in the second class. They have been able to answer questions. One Catholic teacher was very highly appreciated. On several occasions he gave, and gave very well, the Catholic doctrine on Marriage, and when he had to leave to join the Army his departure was the occasion for a graceful tribute from the clergyman leader. Others attend the rest of the second class groups, and their contributions are valued by all. Here is evidently a new field for the energies of the C.E.G.

After the studies had gone some little way the various clubs met together in their several districts to pool results. The findings up to date were duly read by the leader of each group. Here the single point of difference arose. Is marriage indissoluble? It is said that many non-Catholics have no notion of the strength of the Catholic argument for indissolubility. At least that cannot be said for those who attended these meetings. Holy Scripture, the Council of Trent, Tradition, the Papal Encyclicals, all rendered their testimony. The only thing remaining was the objection which (such as it is) will always remain, from hard cases. Then the allowance of birth control by the Lambeth Conference came up. To this we had the opportunity of opposing the arguments from Holy Scripture, the natural law, and the testimony of reputable physicians. On the whole a very successful meeting.

Thereupon we recommenced our work, and in due course all the findings of the groups were in the hands of the secretary of the movement. At a later date the secretary, together with a priest, his neighbour, and a Nonconformist minister were delegated to digest the various conclusions, and to bring the fruit of their work to a general meeting of the committee—not the inner committee consisting of six, but a larger one comprising twenty-one members. The Nonconformist delegate never appeared, so that the work was done by the other two. At the end of their labours the

draft was submitted to the committee. It would have been difficult to find a more critical company. Everyone with the best intentions was determined to obtain the richest fruit from the discussions which had taken place for so many weeks and months. The document was referred back to the secretaries for redrafting in the light of the judgements expressed. After a short delay it was redrafted and submitted to the inner committee, which after mature consideration drew up the conclusions and published them in the local press.

The Editor was most helpful. In spite of the restrictions on his space, he published the whole document, and the evening afterwards wrote a leading article, commending the labours and the conclusions of the groups. There were a few letters in the newspaper later, all in commendation. The interest aroused among the most diverse folk was considerable. At the next meeting of the committee it was decided to publish the conclusions broadcast. A very large number were printed, and so great was the demand that a new order has been given for some thousands. Of course, if the sheets had been distributed gratis, one might have said, "Well, all you have to do is to get a few keen distributors to take them round, and push them under each door in the streets, and you will get rid of thousands." We did not adopt that method (though indeed it has much to commend it, and may well be adopted on some future occasion), but each pamphlet had to be bought, even though the price was only one penny.

We think the work has been well worth while. After reading the findings at the end of this article I trust my readers will agree with me. (In the course of a correspondence conducted by two Church of England clergymen on the comparative advantages of "churches and pubs", one of the writers remarked that if his opposite number devoted his time to assisting the work of the New Christian Order, instead of praising "pubs", he would do better. Out of curious newspaper correspondences come sensible suggestions!) A caviller will have room to say that the meaning attached to such words as grace and sacrament is not the same for Catholic and non-Catholic. It has not been our object to stress the differences which we well know divide us, but to bring to light the very many points on which we agree. He would be a difficult person who would maintain that there are not many more points of agreement in the findings as published than anyone would have dreamt we should be able to discover. When we were making out the declaration the Chairman, who holds with his group that marriage is a sacrament, said, "I fear we shall not be able to agree upon calling marriage a sacrament, because our Nonconformist friends do not hold that." The principal Nonconformist present said, "We have no objection. Every time I read the marriage service I say in three places that marriage is a sacrament," and thereupon in went the word upon which we had no hope of agreement.

It will be asked what definite advantages are to be found in the work—or, rather, what advantages we are finding. May I mention three?

(a) The respectful hearing given by non-Catholics of every denomination to the presentation of Catholic doctrine, which is found much more attractive and compelling than such incorrect ideas as had perchance hitherto been accepted. Minds are disabused of wrong notions, and the light of the truth begins to enter souls.

(b) A consciousness of united endeavour to counteract the un-Christian trend of things around us ; added strength to attack unmoral and immoral practices.

(c) Finally—and for not a few this may well seem the most valuable effect—the unrivalled opportunity of delivering to one's own flock, in duly reasoned form, the truths once delivered to the Saints. Who can hold a congregation, in such wise as to give them the whole truth on any subject ? Our sermons are so little connected week by week. The Feasts and the Gospels differ so much ; there is so much to say, and so little time in which to say it. Even where we have a short sermon at each Mass, the calls upon mothers, and on fathers too in these days, are such as to compel us to touch very lightly upon many subjects which our pastoral experience shows to be necessary. At evening service, when, as some writers tell us, there is more time to dwell upon the sacred subjects, how many hearers do we get ? And they are not the ones whom we need to reach. Those to whom God has perhaps given greater talents and greater opportunities of influencing the un-Christian world around do not appear. We are left preaching to a mere handful of devout souls who do not need, and maybe do not desire, anything better than to say their prayers in peace, and from time to time to hear a few words, simple words, that will help them through the week, with its invariable run of exhausting duties. They have not the circle of activities best calculated to spread the Faith. Those whom we would reach have, often quite reasonably, a desire to take their rest on Sunday evenings.

With these, or at any rate with some of these, we do make contact at the week-night meetings of the Sword of the Spirit. And what is more, they persevere ; and, God providing, they profit thereby. Would that many more would come ; but at least we do reach a few. From time to time the non-Catholic partners of the students come to the class. And when we see men on leave from their military duties attending our meetings, we cannot fail to think that they are feeling the powerful attraction of the Truth.

May I venture to put on record one of the things which has struck me most forcibly ? It is the sterling goodness of not a few non-Catholic clergy. When Mgr. Benson wrote his books he portrayed more than one non-Catholic of genuine worth, men whose virtues would seem to have fitted them for the priesthood better than ourselves, save for God's choice. We might have thought that he exaggerated their goodness because of his affection for the past. Not a bit of it. One has not to mix for long with such men as one finds in this district (and doubtless this district has no

corner in good men) without feeling the constant need to refurbish the armour of the spiritual life. There is a great deal of self-sacrifice among our separated brethren, which can well serve as a spur to us who have the greater graces.

Canon 1350 says: "Ordinarii locorum et parochi acatholicos, in suis dioecesisibus et parocciis degentes, commendatos sibi in Domino habeant." Sometimes thinking on the force of the words "commendatos in Domino", we must wonder how we can clear our consciences. There is not much rhetoric in the Code.

The group in my parish decided, after the publication of the findings on marriage, to have a short *recollectio*. Some forty of us assembled at 2.30 on a Sunday afternoon in a school-chapel attached to the parish. A conference was given at 2.45; afterwards we meditated to the best of our ability, and then walked about for a space. At 4.30 we met again in the chapel for a discussion on the work accomplished, and upon methods for the future. At 5 o'clock we took a cup of tea—fasting fare or war-time fare—and at 5.30 we reassembled in chapel for another meditation. We concluded with sermon and Procession of the Blessed Sacrament in the Parish Church. The whole thing was a great success.

It is said there are dangers in the work of the Sword of the Spirit. Well, of course there are; there is danger in everything. But we need not fear such dangers as will arise; at least such is our experience hitherto. At any rate we all know what they are, and the work of the Sword does not appreciably increase them. And to our good laity there is apparently no danger. Serenely confident in God and in God's Faith they move without hurt among their non-Catholic friends, and find a joy and contentment in helping them to find some of the peace which surpasses understanding in the fellowship of the Saints.

What of the future? We are studying regularly the Pope's First Peace point from the Notes for Discussion, No. VI: *The Commonwealth of Nations*. All of the study-groups are going along full vigour and finding this topic, though so different from the last, just as full of interest. Already we have booked the hall for a second mass meeting in September, for which we are trying to secure the best possible speakers to instruct us. We are confident that the hall will be as completely filled as on the former occasion, and look for great good to come from the gathering.

I am asked if the work entails much extra study and labour. The increase in either can easily be exaggerated. The stores of knowledge we took in at College, even though not kept very bright and clear, easily respond to the call made upon them. The resurrection of long-hidden treasures brings much pleasure. Almost we can take as said to ourselves the poet's words, "forsan et haec olim meminisse juvabit". The response visible in the faces of the hearers is a reward for all our labour. D. K.

A copy is appended of the joint findings on *The Family*, above mentioned:

THE CHRISTIAN NEW ORDER

THE FAMILY AS SOCIAL UNIT

The groups have considered the subject of "The Family as a Social Unit" and all have agreed upon the following findings :

Introduction

The few references in the New Testament to the Holy Family show

- (a) Care for the Child Jesus.
- (b) Obedience of Jesus to His Mother and St. Joseph.
- (c) Regard for the development of mind, body and soul—"Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and man".
- (d) Mutual love and service, with peace and contentment in trial.

We consider, therefore, that the family of Nazareth is the model for all Christian homes.

Marriage

(1) Marriage was instituted by God, Who decreed that the human race should be propagated through divinely instituted wedlock—a sacred and permanent union of one man with one woman.

(2) The primary purpose of marriage is the procreation and education of children for the glory of God.

(3) Another essential purpose of marriage is to give rightful expression to the natural instincts and affections implanted by God. This involves the important truth of the sacredness of sex. This sacredness is only recognized where there is self-control, or rather God-control, since God's creation only reaches its fulfilment when it functions according to His will.

(4) The Church holds up to Christian youth the ideal of marriage as a vocation both by nature and God's grace. It is a solemn and sacred contract which requires Christian preparation and instruction.

(5) Since by Christian marriage the parties are made one, and their union is an image of the union of Christ and His Church, there should be perfect union between husband and wife. Complete similarity of tastes and interests is not required for a happy marriage, but there is need for agreement in the deeper things, and particularly agreement in religious faith and practice.

(6) Marriage is a sacrament. Those who approach it in the right spirit continually receive the necessary grace from God. God does not ask the impossible; and His grace is adequate to enable Christians to do that which they are convinced is His will.

The Family

(1) The family is by nature a primary and necessary society for mankind with essential rights and duties, more sacred than and prior to those of the State. It is the duty of the State to assist family life by protecting the rights of parents and children and by endeavouring to establish such external conditions of life as will assist and not hamper Christian home life. Social reform should be approved or rejected according as it promotes or injures the well-being of the family.

(2) The Christian family is that society wherein father and mother, with mutual good will and self-sacrifice founded on natural love elevated and strengthened by grace, work and pray together that their souls may be saved and their children educated to be dutiful and virtuous Christians and worthy citizens.

(3) It is the duty and privilege of parents to provide for their children, to instruct, guide, and discipline them and to give them a Christian education. It is the duty of children to love, reverence, and obey their parents.

(4) It should be stressed that "the Christian home should be a centre of fellowship into which others can be drawn. Hospitality is repeatedly enjoined in the New Testament, and has been a feature of vital Christianity through the centuries". This excludes the un-Christian idea of "keeping ourselves to ourselves".

The Family and Education

Though education is a subject of itself, it is intimately associated with religion and the family. Therefore we state :

(1) The aim and purpose of true education is to develop the complete personality of the child—body, mind and soul—in accord with the example and teaching of Christ.

(2) The value of the well-ordered and disciplined Christian family cannot be overestimated in its good influence on the child. The good example of parents is the best foundation of an effective education.

(3) In its origin the school came into existence through the family and the Church, and should therefore co-operate with them.

(4) Both parents and children have educational rights which the State should respect and support.

The Family and Housing

(1) A home is not merely a place where the family eats and sleeps, but it is the place in which the mother gladly stays and to which father and children gladly return.

(2) A family dwelling must be such as can be made a home. It must afford privacy for the family as a whole, and for its individual members. It must also be sanitary and spacious, and have reasonable facilities to save unnecessary drudgery.

(3) Mothers should be consulted about planning new houses.

The Family and Economics

(1) Every family should have economic security. This security and well-being of the family are best protected and preserved by the possession of private property. In our day the wider diffusion of private property is essential for vigorous family life.

(2) It is an intolerable evil that mothers, because of the insufficiency of the father's salary, are obliged to engage in gainful occupations outside the home, to the neglect of their proper care and duties, the rearing and education of their children. In this connection we commend the system of family allowances.

(3) Women should be paid equal wages with men for equal work done.

(4) Disability pay, widows' pensions and sick pay should cover the needs of the family, and so relieve mothers of the necessity of going out to work, or of seeking public assistance.

(5) We deprecate excessive hours of work. Sufficient holidays should be given with pay.

Conclusion

The family is the source which gives us life, the school where we first learn to think, and the temple where we first learn to pray; we must, therefore, foster its sanctity, unity and stability.

"No greater blessing can come to individuals, to families, and to nations than that of obeying the Author of our salvation and of following His Law."

MAY, 1942

The Christian New Order Study Groups continue to meet throughout the district, and are studying the Peace Points.

If you wish to join, ask your local clergy for particulars of time and place.

DISTRACTED AS EVER

MAY 31. Trinity Sunday. How is it that the hymn *Jam sol recedit* has (like the Trinity Preface) embedded itself in the structure of the liturgy for the Sundays after Pentecost? And not as a Sunday, but as a Saturday, Vespers hymn; the other hymns of the ferias have traced the process of

creation, down to the beasts on Friday, and there should have been a Saturday hymn about resting. *Jam sol recedit* is not specially sabbatical, although two lines of it are rendered by the old Primer :

Thus may we sing ourselves to rest
Amid the music of the blest . . .

and if that is not good translation, I should like to know what is. . . . I admire St. Augustine's conceit, in the 9th lesson, which represents the human race as beggars at the door of the great Householder . . . I never quite get over a slight feeling of surprise at the feminines, *creatrix* and *gubernatrix*, in the Benedictus antiphon, but I suppose they are all right, being used as adjectives.

June 2. It seems odd that Hebrew women didn't ordinarily pray in silence, yet moving their lips ; which is a common practice enough nowadays. When Anna did so (1st lesson), Heli thought she must be drunk.

June 4. Corpus Christi. I should be very grateful for the loan of an English word which will adequately translate the word *dijudico* in both its contexts (3rd lesson). . . . How many breviary lessons (if any) are taken from St. Thomas, outside the Corpus Christi office (which he composed himself) ? No doubt the main part of the breviary was already stereotyped by his time ; but is it not strange considering the position he holds in Catholic thought, that nobody quarried in his works when they were composing offices for the more modern feasts—the Sacred Heart, for example ? . . . It always seems a curious irony that today's 8th lesson should contain the phrase about pressing the Sacrament of the Lord's Body with one's teeth, which was exploited in the XXXIX Articles as an argument against Transsubstantiation.

June 5. Does the 6th lesson imply that there used to be a distribution of alms (or stipends) to those who attended the recitation of the Divine Office, except in the Corpus Christi Octave, when you got an indulgence instead ?

June 6. I wish the splendid story of Samuel's call was not spoilt, for us converts, by memories of the Anglican hymn :

The old man, meek and mild,
The priest of Israel, slept ;
His watch the Temple child,
The little Levite, kept . . .

with that awkward ambiguity about the meaning of the word "watch". . . . The second Nocturn lessons are an admirable piece of St. Chrysostom ; they run as if they had been written in Latin, instead of being a translation.

June 7. Sunday within the Octave. St. Gregory is profound beyond his wont, on the theme of *Qui te gustant, esuriunt, qui bibunt, adhuc sitiunt*.

June 8. I am never quite certain that I understand St. Augustine's logic in the 8th lesson. He proves at great length that the body derives its

life from the spirit, not the other way round. Then he says you must belong to the Body of Christ in order to possess His Spirit, because it would be absurd to expect the spirit of one person to be present in the body of another. I have never been able to see why the first bit of the proof was necessary, but I dare say I am being stupid about it.

June 11. Could not Holy Church provide St. Barnabas with a second feast at some other time in the year, when he would not be (almost invariably) blacked out by a Movable Feast?

June 13. Who would think, to read today's second Nocturn, that St. Anthony was the Saint he was and (still more importantly) is? There is nothing about pigs, even.

June 14. Sunday in the Octave. The last sentence of the 6th lesson is a little unkind, with its *plerumque*.

June 17. The statement, at the beginning of the 1st lesson, that Saul was only a year old when he became king, and only reigned two years, might well be the subject of a *responsum* from the Biblical Commission. The critics seem to think that the scribe wasn't sure about either figure, and left a row of dots which somehow got filled up with these very unconvincing statistics. In Acts xiii, 21 the length of the reign is put down as forty years; and presumably St. Paul would get it right, since he must have regarded King Saul as his Patron Sinner (1 Cor. ix, 27, x, 11). Pious authors explain that the new King was as innocent as a child of one year old.

June 18. The reference to a day's ploughing in the 2nd lesson recalls to me, unseasonably, the statement in the *Lays of Ancient Rome* that the senate gave Horatius as much land as "two strong oxen could plough from morn till night". On which Mr. Belloc observes that it is a good instance of historians being quite ignorant of life, the area in question being the sort of allotment you would give to a railway porter to work on in his spare time.

June 21. 4th after Pentecost. I have never quite understood why St. Jerome (1st lesson) casts aspersions on Goliath's origins. He was "a mighty man" in the LXX, a "champion", or "representative", in the Hebrew; literally, "a man between two"—a Lapidé explains, "between two (possible) fathers". . . . St. Augustine's parable (5th lesson) of the chained dog is full of encouragement; but it is sometimes so difficult at first sight to be sure how long the chain is.

June 22. How did St. Alban, in the 6th lesson, manage to get up to the top of a "neighbouring mountain", if he was martyred at St. Albans? Hertfordshire does not seem to rise 600 feet above sea-level.

June 23. I like the Collect, which also figures in a devotion too seldom used, though it is in all our breviaries, the *Itinerarium Clericorum*. St. John evidently ought to be the Patron Saint of roads (and perhaps of railways), in honour of Luke iii, 4-5.

June 24. A correspondent writes to me to complain about the Lauds hymn, *O nimis felix*. He doesn't like *nemorumque cultor*, and would restore

the old *eremique cultor*, at the expense of a double false scansion. It's true that Dryden's "sylvan prophet" is a bit too Renaissance—one always pictures St. John as laying axes to the roots of trees. What about *speculum* (although I admit the form doesn't occur)? But he is still more worried by the suggestion, in verse 2, that we have to imagine the Baptist as wearing no less than three hundred garlands. I think he is wrong here; St. John has three garlands, one as a Confessor, one as a Martyr, one as a Prophet, only this metaphor has got rather tied up with another metaphor, that of the field which produces a hundredfold crop (Matthew xiii, 8). I suppose the hymnographer roughly identified his 1-2-3 progression with the 30-60-100 progression of the parable. But all the three hymns are a bit over-classical. . . . The second antiphon at Lauds raises the old question whether Zachary was deaf as well as dumb. My own suspicion is that they made signs to him behind Elizabeth's back, so as not to worry her. . . . Why, I wonder, has the breviary no commemoration of St. Elizabeth? She (with her husband) has a feast, it appears, on the 5th of November.

June 26. I am bothered by the word *nubibus* in the Magnificat antiphon at second Vespers of St. John and St. Paul. The idea of opening and shutting heaven looks as if it were just an expansion of the words which immediately follow, about their tongues being the keys of heaven (cf. the first verse of *Beate Pastor Petre*). But "clouds" would suggest some miracle connected with the weather. (See Apoc. xi, 6.)

June 27. The last sentence of the 3rd lesson makes a good preaching text.

June 28. 5th after Pentecost. Today's Collect is one of the most beautiful we have; I think the repetitions of the word *omnis* contribute a good deal to the effect. . . . St. Augustine, in the 8th lesson, seems to regard *Raca* as a kind of meaningless swear-word; perhaps I ought to have translated it "Pish!"

June 29. I should like to have heard St. Leo preaching that second-Nocturn sermon. . . . The office for the feast gives you a slight impression that St. Paul hasn't quite had enough of a look-in, until you get to the Magnificat antiphon at second Vespers, where the words *lumen orbis terrae* make it all right.

June 30. I wish they hadn't left out, in the middle of St. Chrysostom's homily, the words "That they might contribute something, too, of their own; that it might not seem as if everything came from his grace, and their crowns were given them at random"; it would make an instructive contrast with St. Augustine in the second Nocturn.

July 1. What a very curious statement of St. Chrysostom's, in the 5th lesson, "Ideo non ait, Exiit sanguis et aqua; sed exiit aqua primum et sanguis". I cannot find that there is any manuscript which reads "water and blood" instead of "blood and water". St. Augustine has equally bad luck with the point he makes over the word *aperuit* (7th lesson). The Latin version presumably depends on a reading *enoixen* (from *anoigo*), but all our Greek MSS. have *enuxen*, "pricked".

July 2. Our Liturgy is derived, I suppose, in the long run from a multitude of independent, and often inconsistent, local traditions. If you had sat down and invented a set of feasts for the Christian Year, you would not have put the Visitation on July 3, and the Nativity of St. John on June 25. Actually, the Visitation ought to come almost immediately after March 25.

July 5. 6th after Pentecost. How old was the lamb in Nathan's parable supposed to be? He had bought it, and nourished it, and it had "grown up" with his children. A lamb born this March would be heavy for the bosom.

July 7. It would be easy to sit down and have a good long distraction over St. Cyril and St. Methodius. The complaint one is inclined to make at first sight is, if they were going to provide the Slavs with an alphabet (end of the 4th lesson), why couldn't they provide them with a Latin alphabet, to make them good Europeans? But we can hardly blame them for not foreseeing the doom of Constantinople. They lived, by the way (I have had to look this up), in the second half of the ninth century. All the same, if the Slavs had been converted to the Roman rite and the Roman characters when they were converted to the Roman faith, how infinitely different the history of Europe might have been! But this is not the *Tablet*. In view of St. Methodius' huge importance, it is odd that one never hears of anybody being named after him.

July 8. St. Elizabeth has to her credit a Matins hymn which is undoubtedly in a metre, but in a metre which I can neither match nor put a name to; and, of course, the miracle of the roses. But surely, it was bread, not money (5th lesson), that turned into roses? Nowadays she would have been criticized for supporting a policy of appeasement.

July 9. The second Nocturn responsories for the two English martyrs are admirably constructed.

July 12. 7th after Pentecost. I wonder why St. Hilary, in the 7th lesson, talks about *iniquae arbores*? The *arbor mala* of the Vulgate is already weak enough, as an equivalent for "the rotted tree".

July 13. Ought one to bow one's head in mentioning the name of Cletus, on St. Anacletus' day?

July 14. I am always sorry about King David's deathbed utterances.

July 15. I like the phrase, used of an Emperor, "*temporalis regni non contentus angustiis*".

July 16. Is there still an indulgence for calling a Carmelite a Carmelite (5th lesson)? The 6th lesson is very guarded, you notice, about the Scapular privileges. . . . What does the Benedictus antiphon mean? "The head of a king bound in the channels" is Douay's contribution; nor can I make much more sense out of the A.V., "The king is held in the galleries". Gesenius' Hebrew dictionary says "in curls", which looks like a guess; everywhere else it seems to mean "water-troughs".

July 17. St. Alexius is a curious Saint; not merely because the example

which the Collect wants us to follow is such a peculiar one, but because it seems as if our only authority for his story was a document written by himself. But it takes all sorts to make a heaven.

July 18. St. Camillus endears himself to the reader by having learnt grammar at the age of thirty-three, by calling his five complaints (what a word!) "the mercies of the Lord", and by dying, appropriately, when the most beautiful phrase in the office for the dying was in recitation.

July 19. 8th after Pentecost. The story of Hiram's disappointment (3rd lesson) is all the more obscure because nobody seems to know the meaning of "Chabul". Josephus says it is Phoenician for "not pleasing", but he is thought to have invented the idea. . . . I am always irreverently affected by the rich man saying (in today's Benedictus antiphon), "Give an account of thy stewardship, alleluia".

July 21. Praxed, like Methodius, is a name that doesn't seem to have caught on. Was it supposed to be Greek for "Handsome does"? The odd thing about St. Praxed is that she seems to have prayed for death, not for martyrdom; that, at least, is how her prayer was answered. Once again you can be grateful for the different ways in which Saints are constructed.

July 22. The second verse of the Lauds hymn is admirable; so is the Primer's translation of it:

The drachma's now found cleared from rust,
The diamond sifted from the dust,
And set with shining stars to vie
In heaven's enamelled canopy.

I wish, though, that St. Mary Magdalen had been provided with a more suitable short chapter for Lauds and Vespers. Why does she have a *Credo* at Mass? I am unable to formulate any reflex principle to account for this.

July 25. St. Chrysostom appears to tell us, at the beginning of the 8th lesson, that the two sons of Zebedee went on ahead, so as to be able to approach our Lord in private with their request. I had thought at first that it must be a mistake of inadvertence; but I see now there are some inferior MSS. which read "went in front of him", instead of "went up to him", by a change of one letter.

July 26. 9th after Pentecost; Feast of St. Anne. There is not much to be known about St. Anne, and I like to get my composition of place for her out of those first-Nocturn lessons for a Holy Woman. Though, indeed, St. Anne did not live on that fine scale. The girdle was handed over to a merchant, not to a Chanaanite (at the end of the 2nd lesson). I should have thought St. Anne might have had a special gospel of her own, or at any rate shared one with St. Joachim.

July 27. Poor St. Pantaleon; no glorious name written in heaven has been so dragged in the dust of earth. And all, it seems, because he was a favourite Saint with the Venetians; and the "lean and slippered pantaloons" of the Italian masque was supposed to be a typical Venetian. So the books

of reference say ; I would have been prepared to believe it was a joke against doctors. I hope his church still stands in Cologne.

July 28. St. Innocent is the only Confessor I can think of who is celebrated in red. His burial-place remains obscure to me ; but I suppose my Roman brethren know all about the Bear with a Hat on.

July 29. I think I would like St. Martha to have had a double feast like her sister. I see the reasons against, but I still think so.

July 31. *Patefecerat*, in the last sentence but one of the 4th lesson, should quite certainly be *patefecisset*. Not, I need hardly say, that I doubt the Saint's word ; I write as a grammarian. I like the Saint's remark in the middle of the 6th lesson, though I am not sure that Bossuet would have ; it is a bit theocentric. They were slow canonizers in those days ; St. Ignatius waited for over sixty years, and was canonized by Gregory XV. (This Pope only reigned for two years, and canonized also St. Philip, St. Francis Xavier, and St. Theresa.)

Aug. 1. The fifth responsory at Mattins is an ingenious echo of Isaias lii, 1, 2.

Aug. 2. 10th after Pentecost, and 1st in August. Why cannot they go on being Sundays after Pentecost, for the purposes of the first and second Nocturn ? I could never understand this "August" business. . . . It is interesting to see, in the 8th lesson, that St. Augustine seems to identify *praying* with *making requests*, though Latin, like French (and unlike English), has two separate words for the two ideas.

Aug. 4. The 6th lesson leaves out—you may almost say, glazes over—the really remarkable thing about St. Dominic's life. Which is, that he died when his Order was only six years old. Only six years, to impress so vivid a character on an Order so enduring.

Aug. 5. The meteorological note at the beginning of the 5th lesson seems hardly necessary in these days of travel. That is, if we are going to have any more days of travel.

Aug. 6. I cannot get over the fact that it was Urban VIII, whom one associates with heavy pseudo-classicism, that wrote today's Lauds hymn ; a lovely composition, which might have come straight out of the *Jesu dulcis*.

Aug. 7. I cannot say that I like the form "haeresum", which occurs in the 6th lesson. *Haeresis* does not, after all, increase in the genitive.

Aug. 9. 11th after Pentecost, 2nd in August. The second sentence of the third Nocturn means, I suppose, that of all the vain things in this world, commenting on their vanity is the vainest. This is cynicism pushed to its utmost lengths, and I respect King Solomon for it.

Aug. 10. I do not think St. Leo is at his happiest over St. Laurence. He writes rather in the vein of St. Ambrose, forcing the note sometimes. . . . I hope St. Laurence really did say "assatum est jam" (as in the Magnificat antiphon at second Vespers) ; it is in the manner of our own English martyrs, with their characteristic holy jokes.

Aug. 12. The story about St. Clare and the pyx is the kind of thing

which makes me wish the breviary was published with footnotes. Was the ceremony licit, or do we have to say that it was a special inspiration?

Aug. 13. The martyrdom of St. Cassian always reminds me of a passage in the Menology at St. Edmund's, about somebody whose name I forget, "A schoolmaster, who suffered on this day"; and how one of my colleagues turned to me and whispered, "Why *this* day, particularly?"

Aug. 15. I wonder what is the source of the first responsory at Mattins? Beyond a vague reminiscence of Cant. v, 12, the first part of it does not seem to be taken from scripture . . . The selection of the gospel for this feast will always be a puzzle; it was a happy inspiration, since it has given us, all through the Octave, St. Augustine's praise of the contemplative life.

Aug. 16 (12th after Pentecost and 3rd in August). In St. Joachim's third Nocturn, I always find some difficulty about believing in Panther. His name does not even remotely suggest any Hebrew root; and if it was Greek, he ought not to have called his son Barpanther.

Aug. 18. What *date* is implied in St. John Damascene's account of the Assumption? If we take *universi Apostoli* literally, it would include St. James, who was martyred long before St. Denys (6th lesson) was converted.

Aug. 19. I see that all the scholars are completely flummoxed by the reference (3rd lesson) to the chariots of Aminadab.

Aug. 20. I am glad that St. Bernard died in the Assumption Octave; his spirit is so exactly in tune with these summer glories of our Lady.

Aug. 22. Why does the 8th lesson refer to "the penitent Lazarus"? There must be some tradition about him which is quite unknown to me.

Aug. 23. 13th after Pentecost and 4th in August. It is an acute comment of St. Augustine, in the 9th lesson, that the word *Praeceptor* is unexpected on the lips of one demanding bodily healing; more often, when our Lord is called "Rabbi", the title comes from people demanding instruction. But Mark ix, 17 seems to spoil the argument rather.

Aug. 24. Is it only an Anglican speculation whether St. Bartholomew was the same as Nathanael in the first chapter of St. John? And is there any independent tradition about who Nathanael was, and what became of him?

Aug. 25. How does one pronounce the word *Blanchae* in the 4th lesson? Blankay, or Blanchay? . . . The 9th lesson is still a nightmare to me; I cannot make head or tail of St. Ambrose when he writes like that.

Aug. 29. But when St. Ambrose is at his best, how well he can write! The lessons of today's second Nocturn have all the drive of Cicero in them; and the words "Os aureum illud exsangue, cuius sententiam ferre non poteras, conticescit, et adhuc timetur" have all the bite of Tacitus. Nor is St. Augustine unworthy of his father in the faith, at the end of the 8th lesson; you can see him opening his eyes wide as he spits out the words, "Peperit filiam, filiam *SALTANTEM*".

But if you thought August the 30th was the 5th Sunday in August, you were mistaken. It turns out to be the 1st Sunday in September, and, once again, you have been caught with the wrong volume. R. A. KNOX.

ASTON HALL AND THE PASSIONISTS

ASTON HALL, Aston-by-Stone, Staffordshire, has played an important part in the story of the Catholic Church in England; an outpost of the faith in the time of persecution, it was, in the Second Spring, to be the home of the Ven. Dominic of the Mother of God and the first foundation of the Passionists in England.

Competent authorities assert that there was a house on the estate even in Anglo-Saxon times, and in the Domesday Book Aston is mentioned as the property of Robert de Stafford, a companion of William the Conqueror. Later it came into the possession of the Stanleys, Earls of Derby, and from them it passed to the old Catholic family of Heveringham, who held it during the period of persecution. From them in turn it passed by marriage to another well-known Catholic family, the Welds of Lulworth, in Dorset; the daughter of Bridget Heveringham, heiress of Aston, who had married Sir James Simeon, becoming the wife of Humphrey Weld. It was their grandson, Thomas Weld, who, towards the close of the eighteenth century, sold the estate. But at the suggestion of his eldest son Thomas, later to be raised to the cardinalate, he retained the house to serve as a residence for a priest, and fourteen acres of land to endow the mission that had sprung up around the Hall.

Here is a description of the Hall and gardens as they were in the middle of the eighteenth century: "The ancient mansion, Aston Hall, was a large and magnificent edifice, built in the form of a half H and stood in an extensive plot of ground surrounded by a moat, filled with water and having a stone bridge. . . . On the outside of the moat were beautiful grass walks. Delightful gardens, richly stored with a variety of fruits, stretched themselves to the North; to the South, avenues of noble lime trees spread their ample shades around the largest and finest bowling green imaginable." After this period the house was not regularly inhabited by any family and in consequence both it and the gardens fell somewhat into decay.

The Catholic owners of the Hall, even when not in actual residence, always provided a priest to care for the surrounding Catholics as soon as the state of the country permitted it. The names of these priests can be traced back to 1718, when a Fr. Peter Jones was chaplain to the family. He was succeeded in 1722 by a Dr. Brand, who came over from Douai. In 1797 the Hall gave refuge to a French émigré priest, the Abbé Morais, who by his zeal and earnestness won the esteem and affection of the people. He took an especial interest in the youth of the district, instructing them in their religion and on Sundays, between the services, allowing the boys to play in the grounds.

After the return of the Abbé to France the Hall came for the first time into the possession of religious. Two Franciscans came to take the Abbé's

place, and a little later, through the good offices of Cardinal Weld, the Hall was offered to their Order for a novitiate and house of studies. The Franciscans, who at this time were endeavouring to rebuild their once flourishing province in England, entered into possession with high hopes. They built a new wing to house the community, which then included the Rt. Rev. J. W. Hendren, O.S.F., afterwards the first bishop of Clifton. The foundation, however, did not prosper; the novitiate was closed after a few years and by 1833 most of the community had left. One priest remained to serve the mission for another six years, and it was then taken over by a secular priest, the Rev. Benjamin Hulme. A notable event occurred during his period at Aston: the discovery in 1839 of the relics of St. Chad which were found hidden behind an altar. These relics, together with vestments and sacred vessels, were brought to Aston by the Fitzherberts from their family seat at Swinnerton, Staffordshire. When, after some years, they returned to Swinnerton the relics were unaccountably left behind. They are now preserved in the cathedral church of St. Chad in Birmingham, and carried each year in solemn procession around its precincts.

With the departure of the Franciscans, Aston did not entirely lose its character as a religious house. Through the kindness of Cardinal Weld, four Bridgettine nuns, two choir and two lay sisters, were allowed to take up residence in part of the Hall. After the death of the two choir sisters, who are buried in a mausoleum in the grounds, the two lay sisters left.

We come now to what the inhabitants call the golden days of Aston, when the Hall, through its association with the Passionists, played no small part in the revival of English Catholicism. The Passionists owed their possession of Aston Hall to Bishop, afterwards Cardinal, Wiseman, who was at the time, 1841, co-adjutor to Bishop Walsh, Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. When Rector of the English College in Rome, Wiseman became acquainted with the Passionist, Ven. Dominic of the Mother of God, then resident in the Eternal City at the Mother House of his Order, SS. John and Paul's. Both had in common an ardent zeal for the conversion of England. Dominic's love for England was indeed no ordinary one; it would be true to say that it was divinely inspired. As a boy he had been filled with a great desire for the conversion of unbelievers, and later, when he became a Passionist, it was made known to him while kneeling before a statue of Our Blessed Lady that this desire would be fulfilled and that England would be the scene of his special labours. Dominic was convinced that this light was from God and that therefore he would be the providentially chosen instrument to bring to pass what St. Paul of the Cross, the founder of the Passionists, had seen in prophetic vision: the Passionists established in England and working for its conversion. When Dominic, in June, 1840, was eventually sent to Belgium to establish a house of his order at Ere, near Tournai, Bishop Wiseman was favourably placed to satisfy his friend's intense longing to come to England. With

the consent of Bishop Walsh he offered Aston Hall as the first Passionist foundation in England, and it was gratefully accepted.

Dominic, with one companion, took possession of the Hall on 17 February, 1842, renaming it St. Michael's Retreat. He describes the house as containing about twenty sleeping-rooms with a church containing an organ, vestments and other appointments. "It surpassed," he said, "all his expectations and he did not think there could be another place in England more suitable." The very next day after their arrival the two began the full Passionist choir observance, including the night office of Matins. It was an uphill fight. Not many of the postulants who offered themselves persevered, but with additional priests from Italy there was always a sufficient number to continue full community life.

Among the first Passionists at Aston Hall a few must be singled out for special mention. There was Fr. Ignatius, son of Earl Spencer, who after his conversion became a priest and then a Passionist, joining the Order at Aston in 1847. He had long been a friend of Ven. Dominic and one of the prime movers in bringing the Passionists to England. He, like Dominic, was consumed with zeal for the conversion of England, journeying all over these islands and much of the continent to seek prayers for this intention. Kings, princes and ministers of state were among the many whom he besought to join a crusade of prayer for England's conversion. One special feature of his work was what he called his "little missions", lasting half a week. Between 1858 and 1864 he preached two hundred and forty-five of these, and he was on his way to another when he collapsed and died at Carstairs, 1 October, 1864, a short distance from his friend Monteith's house. Before leaving this zealous apostle for England's conversion let us recall his prayer for England: "O God, have mercy on England. Turn, O Jesus, Thy meek eyes upon that people. Let pity drop from Thy glorious wounds and mercy from Thy Heart. In what she is blind, in what she sins, forgive her, for she knows not what she does. Have mercy on England."

Another member of the community was Fr. Charles Houban, a Dutchman, who died in the odour of sanctity in the Passionist monastery at Mount Argus, Dublin, in 1893, and whose cause for beatification is already far advanced. He was a model of religious observance and much beloved by the people of Aston, who were not slow to appreciate his great holiness.

Fr. Gaudentius Rossi, founder of the Sisters of the Cross and Passion, who have done so much for education in the North of England, lived at Aston before going to America to assist in the foundation of the Passionists in that country. The baptismal register still in use for Aston contains entries by all these eminent Passionists as well as by Fr. Dominic.

But Ven. Dominic was the moving spirit of those first few years at Aston; as the first superior he directed the labours of the little community. His first sermon to the people deserves mention, highly reminiscent as it is of St. John the Evangelist's sermon on charity. "I wish," said Fr. Dominic, "to say a few words to you for your edification, but I cannot do it because

I am not yet able to speak English. However, I shall say something—a very short sermon. My dearly beloved, let you love one another because they who love their brethren perfectly accomplish the will of God. Let you love God and men for God's sake and you shall be perfectly happy for ever. Amen." In March he went further and preached a week's retreat to the little congregation. To strengthen the people in their faith and enable them to help in the conversion of England he founded a very successful Catholic Society, in which, after the manner of our present-day study circles, the members obtained a deeper knowledge of their faith.

The feast of Corpus Christi at Aston in 1844 was noteworthy for the first procession of the Blessed Sacrament ever held in the district and for a striking intervention of Divine Providence. For, as is fully attested in the processes for the beatification of Ven. Dominic, the rain poured in torrents except on that part through which the procession passed. The Protestants in their amazement could not withhold the cry: "The devil is in these Papists." Fr. Dominic has left his own record of the celebrations: "Last Thursday, feast of Corpus Christi, we had a beautiful procession in our grounds with all possible splendour—triumphal arches, altars and a sermon preached out of doors. There were fully a thousand people, half of whom were Protestants. Yesterday (Sunday) we repeated the experience and it was even more magnificent. I believe there were over a thousand Protestants there and as many Catholics from all parts. I hope it will not go without fruit. Such things have never been seen in these countries."

It is not surprising that Dominic's zeal should have awakened the fiercest opposition of the non-Catholic ministers of religion. They did all in their power to keep their people away from him, advertising services at the same hour as his and even erecting a church close to the monastery grounds. Dominic mentions in a letter that during the building of the church part collapsed. He would have been more than human if he had not felt some satisfaction at the discomfiture of his declared enemies.

Fr. Dominic, always a great lover of children, decided to build a little school at Aston. That this was needed is shown by the fact that up to 1854 there are records of 254 infant baptisms, many of the children coming from the numerous Irish families that had settled in the parish. The loving care shown them by the community when they were stricken with the plague decided them to make their home near the monastery. A resident of Stone, who died some years ago and who as a child attended the school, told how on one occasion the schoolmaster was lecturing them for some fault. The interest of the children, however, was elsewhere, and not without reason, for Fr. Dominic was at the window with a large basket of apples, and she, as the youngest, received the largest.

To complete the parish the foundation stone of a church was laid by Bishop Walsh on 21 May, 1846, the sermon being preached by Bishop Wiseman. The architect was Mr. Charles Hansom and the cost was estimated at £1,229. Up to that time a room over the kitchen, which had

been twice enlarged, was used for services; but this very soon proved inadequate to hold the growing congregation. As the building of the church proceeded slowly for want of funds, Fr. Ignatius was sent out on begging tours. On one occasion he was refused under the name of Fr. Ignatius, but succeeded when he sent a message through the footman that he was the brother of Lord Spencer. While thanking the lady he gave her this good advice. "I am very sorry to have to tell you that the alms you have given me will do you very little good. If I had not been born of a noble family you would have turned me away with contempt. I take the money (it was £5) because it will be as useful to me as if it had been given with a good motive, but I would advise you in the future, if you have regard for your soul, to let the love of God and not human respect prompt your almsgiving." The church was not opened till after Dominic's death; indeed, he was actually on his way to Aston to arrange for the opening when he was taken ill in the train and died at Reading, 27 August, 1849. Thus the first solemn function in the church was Fr. Dominic's funeral service.

From Aston was begun the now flourishing parish of Stone, a town about two miles from the monastery. It began in a small way: Dominic went first into the highways and by-ways, preaching his first sermon in the open from a cart in a field called Penfold Croft, now part of the Dominican Convent grounds. On the First Sunday of Advent, 1842, he said what was the first Mass in the town since the Reformation in the assembly room of the Crown Hotel, hired for the purpose. He continued to use it for Mass on Sundays until Mr. Beech, a merchant of Stone, gave him the use of a large room in his house situated in what is now called Margaret Street. This house, known as St. Mary's Home, is now a hostel for aged ladies under the care of the Dominican Sisters, who are pleased to show the room used by Fr. Dominic for Mass.

Through the further generosity of Mr. Beech, who gave a plot of land near his house, it was possible to lay the foundation stone of a church on 19 July, 1843. The plans were drawn up by Mr. Augustus Welby Pugin for a small unpretentious building that would serve as a school chapel. In spite of the difficulties in raising the amount required (£600) the church was opened for public worship on 22 April, 1844, and soon afterwards school began with fourteen children. Fr. Dominic dedicated his first church in England to St. Anne, and very fittingly it was within another church dedicated to this saint, the Passionist church at Sutton, St. Helens, Lancs., that his precious remains were finally laid to rest. When Mother Margaret Mary Hallahan made her foundation at Stone and erected her convent on the property adjoining the church, this was made over by deed to the nuns and their convent chapel served as the parish church. And so today, in the words of Fr. Urban Young, C.P., Fr. Dominic's biographer and Vice-Postulator of his Cause (to whom the writer of this article is much indebted), "visitors to Stone will find the first Passionist church in England still standing and still beautiful, as an oratory tended by the hands of the

daughters of St. Dominic. There did Mother Mary Hallahan pray; there she performed those wonders by her prayers which made her life resemble that of the seraphic virgin of Siena. A monument it stands, in eloquent memory of the poor man who erected it in dark and evil days. It was there, five years later, that the obsequies were performed over his remains." The foundation of this convent by Mother Hallahan was very clearly foretold by Fr. Dominic. To a friend who was lamenting the destruction of the former Augustinian Priory at Stone, on the site of which now stands the parish church, Fr. Dominic said: "You will live, though I shall not, to see another convent and another church, not at the bottom but at the top of the town." This prophecy has been literally fulfilled.

Three times a week Fr. Dominic went to Stone, and besides saying Mass preached controversial sermons which were not without effect; within two years he had received eighty-six converts. But though keenly interested in the good of souls around Aston and Stone, Dominic did not forget that the principal work of the Passionist is the giving of missions and retreats. From Aston Dominic, and later Ignatius, Gaudentius and others of the community, journeyed all over England on missionary work. It was found impossible to satisfy all demands. "Requests," wrote Fr. Dominic, "are without end, and simply cannot be dealt with." Happy were those privileged to make a retreat under the direction of these saintly men. Dominic himself gave missions, among other places, at St. Nicholas's, Liverpool; in Manchester at St. Chad's, and at St. Mary's, Mulberry Street; in London at the old church in Wade Street, Poplar; he was also in Derby, Wolverhampton, Stafford, as well as in parishes near to the monastery. He gave retreats to the priests and students at Oscott, where he had stopped when he first came to England; at Ushaw and St. Edmund's, Old Hall. His first retreat to nuns was given to the Sisters of Mercy in Birmingham. This was followed by retreats to the Benedictine nuns at Caverswall and Little Heywood (these communities are now at Oulton and Colwich respectively), to the Sacred Heart nuns at Roehampton and at the Bar Convent, York.

One other activity of Dominic's at Aston remains to be chronicled, his intense interest in the Oxford Movement. It was but to be expected that one who had so much at heart the conversion of England would follow the course of this movement with the keenest interest. One of its members, J. D. Dalgairns, had written an article in that well-known journal, the *Univers*, on the subject of Anglican Church parties. Dominic replied to it in a letter written in elegant Latin, described by Dom Bede Camm as "a magnificent appeal to follow the divine call to the Catholic Church. . . . It answers the difficulties and objections raised by Anglicans in the most masterful way." A close friendship sprang up between the two men, and when Dalgairns decided to become a Catholic it was to Dominic at Aston that he made his submission on 29 September, 1845. But a still greater event was to follow. Dominic had promised Dalgairns to visit him at

Littlemore in a few weeks, and it was this visit that finally decided Newman to follow the example of his disciple and become a Catholic. "Fr. Dominic, the Passionist," Newman wrote to Wilberforce on 7 October, "is passing this way on his way to Belgium. He is to come to Littlemore for the night as the guest of one of us whom he has admitted at Aston. He does not know of my intentions, but I shall ask of him admission to the one true fold." Dominic shall describe what actually happened. "We reached Littlemore," he wrote, "about an hour before midnight. The door opened, and what a spectacle it was for me to see at my feet John Henry Newman, begging me to hear his confession and receive him into the bosom of the Catholic Church!" Newman recorded the event in his diary. "Oct. 9th. Admitted into the Catholic Church with Bowles and Stanton. *Nunc dimittis servum tuum, Domine, secundum verbum tuum in pace, quia viderunt oculi mei salutare tuum.*" Newman ever after held Dominic in the highest esteem; he even thought of following Fr. Ignatius's example and becoming a Passionist, but it was not to be. But he visited Aston later and spent the last days of 1846 with Dominic and his community.

Another celebrated convert who visited Fr. Dominic at Aston was Fr. Faber, who has left on record this testimony to the holiness of his life: "I think there is one saint living and that is Fr. Dominic the Passionist." It was doubtless this esteem for their founder in England that determined Faber to give over to the Passionists Cotton Hall, where he had established a religious congregation known as the Brothers of the Will of God. Thither the Passionists removed from Aston Hall in 1855, taking with them the body of Fr. Dominic. The giving up of their first home in England, with all its intimate associations with the Ven. Dominic, must have been a cruel blow to the community at Aston Hall, and later generations of Passionists, too, regret the necessity that compelled it.

The parish at Aston was taken over after the departure of the Passionists by Canon Edward Huddleston. He followed in the steps of previous owners and made structural alterations. He demolished the wing that the Passionists had just completed and added one of his own, retaining the part of the house that connected with the church. In 1880 the church was, with ecclesiastical permission, pulled down and re-erected on its present site. It was said to be in danger of collapse through subsidence in the part that lay over the old moat.

In 1909 the archdiocesan authorities sold the Hall and estate but retained the church and an adjoining house to serve as a presbytery. It is pleasing to know that the present owners of the Hall are Catholics, and not unmindful of the great traditions of Aston. The mission is at present served from Stone.

While we pay tribute to all those who made Aston Hall famous, it must be said that none perhaps endured such suffering and contradiction there as Venerable Dominic. The opposition and bigotry he had to encounter were extreme. As he walked from Aston to Stone he was

insulted and reviled. His enemies punned on his name: "Here comes Fr. Demonio, here comes the demon." They even went so far as to stone him. It was beyond anything he had ever imagined; so much that on one occasion he broke down and wept bitterly. But his tremendous zeal for England's conversion and the untiring labour and magnificent help given him by Fr. Ignatius and his other companions enabled him, with God's help, to persevere. In the time to come when, as we pray, Rome will have set her seal on his many virtues, Aston and Stone will receive a new glory as the home and a scene of the apostolic labours of a saint.

HAROLD DOMMERSEN, C.P.

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

THE published proceedings of the National Liturgical Week held at St. Paul, Minnesota, in October 1941,¹ deserve a more careful consideration than is possible in a review of the book, both because of the matters discussed and because the conditions of Catholic life in America do not differ vastly, we imagine, from those in this country. But for the war, we should probably have had a conference of a similar kind here, and much may be learned for our own future guidance from these deliberations.

I

Any movement, as we all know, must be specified by the object towards which it is moving, and even the most enthusiastic efforts of any body of people will be dissipated unless their immediate purpose is clearly defined. The intellectual or theoretical aspect of the subject must always, therefore, have the first place, though it probably appeals least to the faithful who, in ever increasing numbers, are taking a more active part in liturgical worship. Now, it is evident throughout these discussions at St. Paul that, through no fault of the participants, there was no precise and adequate definition of liturgy upon which all were agreed. This obscurity is admitted by the best writers on the subject, e.g. by Callewaert, *De Sacra Liturgia*, n. 6, and it is decidedly a point which ought to be clarified; until this is done liturgical worship can be made to mean anything ranging from conformity with Christ in His sacrifice, which any Christian is presumed to desire, to an active and vocal participation in rites such as Vespers, which comparatively few are willing or able to give. Thus, when a questioner asked whether assistance at Mass whilst using the Rosary or the methods

¹ Published by the Benedictine Liturgical Conference, Newark. Pp. 266. \$1.50.

of St. Leonard of Port Maurice is liturgical, the discussion leader could only answer: "Father, you did it. You certainly posed a tough one." Our own preference is to define liturgical worship in the terms of "*cultus publicus*" contained in Canon 1256, understood in the sense that public worship in its most stable and essential shape is enshrined in the traditional forms of the Missal, Breviary, Ritual and Pontifical; accordingly the object of the liturgical movement is to restore these forms to popular use. The answer to the question put would then have to be that reciting the Rosary at Mass is not a liturgical practice, though it may have everything to recommend it on some other ground.

It is worthy of note that, time and again, the discussion veered round to the Rosary at Mass, some deeming it an excellent thing for the old folks at home who were past reforming, others stressing the Leonine legislation for the month of October. But few will doubt that the Archbishop of Chicago, in choosing the Rosary as the subject of his opening sermon to clergy and laity at a liturgical congress, showed the most admirable judgement. "The Rosary," he said, "breathes a certain liturgical spirit, and seems to us to be one of those popular devotions so akin to liturgical prayer as to allow its being regarded as the fruit of a deep participation in the liturgy." His plea for the habitual use of the beads side by side with liturgical worship was an implied warning against exaggerating the importance of the latter.

II

Assuming that the end or purpose of the liturgical movement is suitably defined to the satisfaction of all, which unhappily is not yet the case, we have next to consider ways and means, things of the practical order which have a greater appeal to the majority of people interested in this subject. It is, of course, obvious that the choice of means must be governed by the end, and attention will be directed to those under discussion which seem to lead most surely to the end as we have conceived it to be.

The first place must be given to what is known as the "dialogue" or "recited" Mass, which was repeatedly examined at the conference from various points of view. An explanation of this method, and the instructions of the Holy See concerning it, may be seen in this REVIEW, 1933, VI, p. 235, and 1941, XX, p. 453. One speaker revealed that, after being practised for a year in a congregation of Catholic students attending a secular university, it died a natural death. In most of the parishes where it had been introduced, at least on certain Sundays and special occasions, the result had been uniformly successful: it had led to a commoner use of the Missal amongst the people and a keener appreciation of their own share in the sacrifice. It has the approval of ninety-eight bishops. Taking it by and large, there can be no doubt that its best chance of success is at the children's Mass in schools and institutions, and most of all in religious

communities. The ideal, however, must always be the full participation of the laity in the responses and common of a sung Mass, and this has been attained in many places by choosing an early hour for its celebration.

The use of the vernacular in liturgical rites appears to many to be absolutely necessary if the faithful are to worship God not only liturgically but reasonably. In some places the "dialogue" Mass is recited in the vernacular: a priest reads in English what the celebrant is saying in Latin and the people answer in English. In other places the vernacular is interchanged with Latin, "Lord, I am not worthy", for example, being recited by all communicants. This is done in over two hundred churches, and so far there has been no official objection to it, though many think it is not quite in order. It is significant that children are found, on the whole, to prefer Latin, and since the youngest boy can learn the Latin responses without much trouble, there seems no good reason why all should not do so.

Apart from Sunday Vespers in some places, and Compline in still more, the participation of the laity in the Divine Office is restricted to small groups of the elect, and one example quoted of the family rosary in common being replaced by the breviary must surely be altogether exceptional.

III

There are obstacles in the path of the liturgical movement, many of which were faced at this conference; and by obstacles we do not mean merely the attachment of the faithful to popular devotions, nor the inherent difficulty of training them to use forms of worship to which they are not really accustomed, but rather—strangely enough—the impediments which liturgical enthusiasts themselves unwittingly introduce.

Everyone who has had anything to do with popularizing liturgy will agree that the great enemy is exaggeration, not only in the unmeasured denunciation of all piety which is not liturgical, but in reviving practices which have long been in abeyance and are no longer in accordance with the rubrics of the modern missal. A good example of this is the ceremony, already discussed in this REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 113, of the faithful bringing up their hosts to the altar at the offertory, a procedure which causes unnecessary confusion and disturbance, especially in a large congregation, besides being definitely against the rubrics. It was pointed out with great truth that the offertory of money is the modern equivalent in all respects of the ancient offertory of bread and wine, and its significance could be suitably stressed by having the collection placed at the foot of the altar during Mass. One priest is accustomed, on certain occasions, to celebrate *versus populum*, a practice which is not against the rubrics indeed, but is sufficiently unusual to cause some bewilderment to the people in the church.

Another grievous obstacle is liturgical art. Nothing is so likely to antagonize a congregation as making a clean sweep of the existing church furniture in favour of the "new art". We can sympathize with the priest who was moved by his bishop after he had himself moved a "beautiful" altar to make room for a "liturgical" one; but the people also have some of our sympathy. They or their fathers paid for the old one and there is absolutely no guarantee that a still newer kind of art will not be flourishing a few years hence. Votaries of art, if one may say so with great respect, are frequently in violent dispute amongst themselves, and are liable to sudden and inexplicable changes in their point of view. One remedy which finds favour in some dioceses is the setting up of an advisory committee, to whose judgement all new projects have to be submitted. This is probably the best solution, provided the committee is not itself exclusively composed of professional artists, of the kind once described by the late Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster as "clamant, loud-voiced, and contradictory". Usually the careful observance of liturgical law, for example, in the construction of an altar will secure a due measure of artistic proportion, and successful applications of this principle were mentioned during the discussions.

The standard of the papers read, the interest aroused, and the points discussed at this conference compare very favourably with similar meetings which have been annual events for some years past in Belgium. Each day opened with a Solemn Mass and sermon in the Cathedral of St. Paul and closed with Compline, whilst a judicious blend of things spiritual, intellectual and practical made the meeting something resembling a retreat for those who assisted.

The Archbishop of St. Paul was present throughout, and, seeing that the deliberations took place in his Cathedral and in the Youth Centre under his jurisdiction, one might have expected that his guidance would always have been sought, as a matter of course, in settling some of the problems raised. The right of a bishop to instruct all comers in his own diocese is more than liturgically sound—it is *iure divino*. No doubt His Grace preferred it so, but not until the last day of the conference, it appears, did he intervene in the discussion: "I have been sitting around here," he said, "for three days and nights, and I didn't have a chance to say a word."

The first page of the book quotes a reviewer of the published proceedings of the previous Chicago conference, writing in the *Catholic Herald*, 27 June, 1941: "Here in Britain we have been dabbling in a liturgical revival for more than a century. How is it that these American Catholics have been able to achieve such startling results in less than a quarter of a century, leaving us miles behind?" The answer to the question is not quoted, but we may observe that many of the authors recommended by the conference for study in America are from these islands, e.g. Abbot Cabrol, Fr. O'Connell, Fr. Thorold, Fr. Martindale and Mr. Attwater. When the

times are more propitious we shall no doubt have a liturgical conference in England, and shall be able to profit from the labours of our brethren in America. But, from the little experience we have had in trying to interest people in the liturgical movement, it is quite certain that, in these parts of the world at any rate, the only sound rule to follow is *festina lente*.

E. J. MAHONEY.

HOMILETICS

Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost

(The Hypostatic Union)

"The kingdom of God is like to a king who made a marriage for his son."

THE parable of today offers opportunity for a treatment of the Hypostatic Union. The king in the parable is God the Father. He, in the Incarnation, made nuptials for His Son, when, in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, by an indissoluble bond, He united the Word to our human nature. At that instant God the Son, without laying aside His Godhead, without acquiring a new personality, took to Himself a human body and a human soul. Humanity was assumed by the Second Person of the Trinity. God became man. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us."

In the treatment of the Hypostatic Union it will perhaps be best to consider first the humanity of Our Lord and then His Divinity.

Jesus Christ was truly man; "being made in the likeness of man, and in habit found as man"; "being born in the likeness of the ordinary man and to all appearance found merely a man amongst men."

He had a human body of flesh and blood; to His disciples He could say: "See My hands and My feet; handle and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see Me to have." A body, not directly created out of nothing, but formed from the blood of human mother and sprung from the flesh of Adam; see His genealogy in St. Matthew and St. Luke. A body that grew from babyhood to manhood, with human powers and human infirmities; a body that, like ours, could feel hunger and thirst, cold and weariness, that, like ours, could suffer pain and submit to death.

He had a human soul, with the same faculties and emotions as ours. A mind that grew in wisdom and knowledge. A will that controlled His actions; that freely withstood temptation; that freely chose to do the will of God: "Not My will, but Thine be done." He had our human emotions. See His sympathy for the widow of Naim; His human love for the little children, for Lazarus, for St. John; His wonder at the faith of the centurion; His anger at the moneychangers in the Temple; His apprehension at coming evils in the garden of Gethsemane and desire for human companionship; His sadness: "My soul is sorrowful even unto death."

Jesus Christ was truly man, with a body and soul like ours. He was more; He was God. God, not in some metaphorical or limited sense; not in the sense that God was made manifest in His life and actions. But God in the sense that He is the eternal Son of God, the Supreme Lawgiver and Judge, the Almighty Lord of life and death. Is proof needed? At His Baptism and Transfiguration the Eternal Father acknowledges Him as His well-beloved Son. In His Sermon He speaks as the equal of the Supreme Lawgiver: "I say to you." On His own authority He judges and forgives sin. He shows forth His almighty power when, by His own power, He recalls the sick to health and the dead to life, especially when He raises Himself from death to life, as He had foretold.

Jesus Christ was truly man and truly God. "Christus perfectus Deus et perfectus homo; totus Deus et totus homo" (St. John Damascene). From all eternity He had existed as a perfect person, the Second Person of the Trinity: God the Son, the Word of the Father. Two thousand years ago He became man. How? Not by shedding His Godhead and becoming for the time merely a human person. Not by entering into an existing human person, and ruling and controlling that person. What happened is well put by Fr. Dalgairns: "Place before ourselves what it was that took place in Mary's womb. A miracle had taken place such as had never been before and never will be again. The Holy Ghost had come and had framed within her, of her best heart's blood, a perfect body and had joined it to a perfect soul. Here was the nature of man all perfect; but if you look at that Sacred Humanity in the first instant of its being, a wonder had happened to it. . . . Before the heart had begun to beat, or the mind to think, before the will had time to frame one affection, the Eternal Word had come and made it all His own. . . . It was not that Mary's Son had been conceived and then the Son of God had come and joined this person to Himself. There was no human personality at all; the only Person that was there was the Everlasting Word Himself" (*The Heart of Jesus*, chap. 2).

By virtue of this assumption of a human nature by the Word all the thoughts of Our Lord were the thoughts of God, His decisions the decisions of God, His words the words of God, His actions the actions of God, His sufferings the sufferings of God. All truly human, but raised to infinite dignity through the infinite dignity of the Person whose thoughts, decisions, words, actions, sufferings they were.

Today, then, we proclaim our belief in the Hypostatic Union. We pray that we may ever hold firmly this belief, knowing that it is the basis of Christianity and the solid foundation of our hope of our full Redemption.

Cf. Encyclical Pius XI, *Lux Veritatis* (A.A.S., XXIII, 1931, p. 493).

Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost
(The Maternity of Our Lady)

"Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bring forth a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel."

Last Sunday the Catholic doctrine of the Hypostatic Union was considered. Today the Church puts before us another truth, one intimately

connected with it : the Divine Motherhood of Our Lady. The two truths stand together ; one safeguards the other. Confess that Our Lord is one divine person with the nature of God and the nature of man, and we confess that she of whom He took flesh is in truth the Mother of God. Confess that Mary is the Mother of God and we confess that her Son is God and man in one divine Person.

Mary is the Mother of God. We do not mean that Our Lord as God was sprung from her, that He took His Godhead from her. That would be impossible. As God He is the eternal Son of the Father. What we do mean is that the person who was born of her in human fashion was not only man, but also God. She was the mother of that person, and therefore Mother of God. As Pope Pius XI puts it : "From the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union there necessarily follows the dogma of the divine maternity which we assert to belong to the Blessed Virgin Mary. 'Not that the nature of the Word or His Godhead', as Cyril admonishes us, 'took the source of its origin from the holy Virgin ; but because He derived from her that sacred body, perfected by an intellectual soul, whereto the Word of God was hypostatically united, and therefore is said to be born according to the flesh.' And, indeed, if the Son of the Blessed Virgin Mary is God, assuredly she who bore Him is rightly and deservedly to be called the Mother of God. If there is only one Person in Christ, and this is divine, without any doubt Mary ought to be called by all, not the mother of Christ only, but Theotocos or God-bearer" (*Lux veritatis*).

That dignity had been foretold in the God-inspired prophecy of Isaias, recalled to our minds by the Church in the Introit of the Mass of today. "Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bring forth a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel." It was of Our Lady that the prophet spoke. Of that we are certain. We have the inspired testimony of St. Matthew.

That the prophecy might be fulfilled God made His preparation. The masterpiece of His creation was made. Mary was born of Joachim and Anne. Into her soul God poured the fullness of His grace. Though a child of Adam, she was preserved from all stain of sin. From the first instant of her existence God dwelt in her soul. The Holy Ghost had chosen her as His spouse, and could say of her : "Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no spot in thee." Her soul was adorned with all the virtues and gifts, so that she excelled in grace and virtue all angels and saints.

To her God sent His angel. She consented to be the mother of Emmanuel, God with us, and in that instant He that is mighty did great things to her. The Holy Ghost came upon her and the power of the Most High overshadowed her. In miraculous fashion He took her virginal blood and formed in her womb the living body of the Word made flesh. The laws of nature were suspended, when by the power of God a virgin became a mother, and then took their natural course. Now could Our Lady say : "He who created me resteth in my tabernacle." God the Son had taken up His abode within her in human form. Not as He takes up His abode in our bodies in Holy Communion ; not by assuming human form and resting within her as He lay in the tomb ; but as living son of human mother. With truth could St. Elizabeth salute her : "Whence is this that the mother of my Lord should come to me ?"

Mary is the Mother of God, with a mother's rights over a son, and a

mother's duties. To her care He confides Himself. She will feed Him, clothe Him, protect Him, teach Him, command Him. He is subject to her. He must love her, respect her, obey her, support her.

Today then with joy, at the behest of the Church, we celebrate the mystery of the divine motherhood of Our Lady. We profess our belief in the teaching of the Church. We thank Our Lady that through her consent to be the Mother of God she has made our redemption possible. With joyous hope, and free from anxious fears, we confide ourselves to her; she will present our prayers to her Son and He will listen to the voice of His mother.

There is one special lesson the Pope would have taught by this feast. Motherhood has been ennobled by the motherhood of Our Lady. Let all mothers live up to that dignity. "In a more special manner it is fitting that those mothers of this our age, who being weary either of offspring or of the marriage bond, despise and violate the obligations they have assumed, should look up to Mary and meditate intently on her who has raised this grave duty of motherhood to such high dignity. For in this way there is hope that they may be led, by the help of grace from the heavenly Queen, to feel shame for the dishonour done to the great sacrament of matrimony, and may happily be stirred up to imitate her admirable and glorious virtues, by every effort in their power."

Cf. Encyclical *Lux Veritatis*.

Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost

(Mission Sunday)

"This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth."

This day has been appointed as Mission Sunday to stimulate interest in the mission of the Church to the heathen, and to impress on our minds the obligation that rests on all of us to co-operate in the extension of the Church throughout the whole world.

God, our Saviour, will have all men to be saved. That is God's own message to us. It is His will that, not only those who already share the benefits of Christian civilization but all men without exception should be saved. Our Lord died that He might bring salvation to all. "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for those of the whole world." "There is one God and one mediator of God and men, the Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself a redemption for all." By His redemption He purchased for all men the graces that are necessary for salvation. That these graces might flow to us through sure and secure channels, He set up His Church, the Catholic Church.

That men may obtain the benefits of Redemption and profit by them, it is necessary that they should come to the knowledge of the truth as taught by Our Lord. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not

believed? And how shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard?" That men might come to the knowledge of the truth, Our Lord set up His Church. To her, and to her alone, He confided the deposit of faith, and so equipped her that she should be able to preserve that truth from any admixture of error and teach it with infallibility.

The Catholic Church, then, has been set up by Our Lord as the ark of salvation and the pillar and ground of truth.

It is the will of Our Lord that, just as all men should be saved, so they should be members of His Church. Visible membership of the Church is, in the intention of Our Lord, the ordinary medium through which the benefits of Redemption may be available to all men. It had been foretold in the Old Law that the Church should embrace all mankind. Our Lord makes known His will clearly: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature," was His commission to the Apostles and through them to their successors; "he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned." "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

It is the will of Our Lord that His Church should spread into all nations and that in it all men should have available the means of salvation. That will is not yet fulfilled. Though the Church throughout her whole history has not ceased to send her missionaries into all parts of the world, still at the end of nineteen hundred years there are boundless tracts that have not yet been laid open to Christian civilization; the Catholic Church comprises little more than eighteen per cent of the people of the world.

"The harvest is great." These millions of men who sit in the darkness and shadow of death, who have never been washed in the waters of Baptism, must be evangelized. It is our privilege to take part in this work of spreading Redemption; it is our privilege to co-operate with Our Lord in leading them to the Father. But it is more than a privilege. It is a definite duty. The words of Pope Pius are clear: "None of the faithful may decline this duty."

Our gratitude for the gift of Faith, our appreciation of the work of the Church, our desire to increase the glory of God, all these impel us to use our privilege. The command of God, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself", imposes on us the obligation.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." By that command we are bound, not only to wish our neighbour well, not only to avoid any injury to him, but to succour him in his time of need. The greater his need, the greater the obligation. "Now, what class of men," says Pope Benedict XV, "is in greater need of brotherly aid than the heathen, who, since they know not God, are bound by unbridled lusts and enslaved in the worst kind of slavery, that of the devil?" They, like us, must wrestle against principalities and powers; they, like us, must stand against the deceits of the devil. Unlike us, they have not the shield of faith nor the word of the Spirit, which is the word of God. True, God gives to all men sufficient grace to be saved. But consider the difficulty of corresponding with that grace without the help of the Church. In spite of all the helps that we have, how difficult we often find it to correspond. In spite of the sacramental graces from the Sacraments we have received, in spite of the

training we have in seeing through the stratagems of the devil, in spite of the strength we receive in Holy Communion, our way to heaven is not easy. What of those who have not these helps?

The heathen is in extreme need of spiritual aid. If we are to obey God's law of charity, we must supply help. We may feed the hungry, we may give drink to the thirsty, we may visit the sick and bury the dead; if we limit our charity to these corporal works of mercy and think we have fulfilled the law, we deceive ourselves. "In proportion as the immortal soul is more precious than the body, so is the charity which labours for the soul more urgent than that which stops short at the wants of the body." Nor let us content ourselves with the consideration that we work for the conversion of heretics; that we pray regularly for the conversion of England. The heathen must have a place in our charity. Is his need not, at least, as great as theirs?

How shall we help the heathen? Popes Benedict XV and Pius XI tell us in their missionary encyclicals and addresses: By fostering vocations, both for the active and contemplative life; by providing medical missionaries and educationalists; by contributing to the support of the missions through the Association for the Propagation of the Faith and the Holy Childhood; by constant prayer . . . not intermittent, but constant, regular prayer.

In obedience to God's command, then, in thanksgiving for the gift of faith, in appreciation of the work of the Church, we must further the missionary work of the Church. We shall ourselves receive God's blessing, we shall extend the blessings of Redemption, we shall give glory to God.

Cf. Benedict XV, *Maximum illud* (A.A.S., XI, 1919, p. 440); Pius XI, *Rerum Ecclesiae* (A.A.S., XVIII, 1926, p. 65).

Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost
(The Kingship of Christ)

"He must reign, for God hath put all things under His feet."

Today the Church would have us keep the feast of Christ the King. This feast has been instituted that through the public veneration of Christ our King blessings may flow to the Church, to nations, and to each of the faithful. We acknowledge the royal dignity of Christ, we pledge our loyalty and obedience, and we pray that all men and nations may recognize that Christ is King.

We publicly proclaim that Christ is King. "The world has heard enough of the so-called 'rights of man'; let it hear something of the rights of God" (Leo XIII). "There is no higher ambition than to unfurl the standards of Christ our King and let them take the wind in the sight of men who have enrolled themselves under false colours" (Pius XII).

Christ is King. He is the supreme lawgiver whom all are bound to obey, who has authority to judge all and power to reward or punish according to deserts. Of Him the angel had announced to His mother: "He

shall reign in the house of David for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end." Him St. John described as "King of kings and Lord of lords". His law runs in spirituals; it runs also in temporals. True, when He claimed kingly power before Pilate, He disclaimed an earthly kingdom: "My kingdom is not of this world. For this was I born, and for this came I into the world, that I should give testimony to the truth." His first object was to rule over men's minds by the truth. He had delegated power in civil affairs to an earthly ruler, He had put Himself under that ruler, and He would not take that power from him. Still by virtue of His Godhead, by virtue of the Hypostatic Union, and by virtue of His Redemption, He has supreme authority not only in religious but also in civil affairs. "All power is given Him in heaven and on earth."

Christ is King. The epistle of the Mass puts that truth before us and gives us the foundation of our belief in it. In all things He holds the primacy.

"He is the image of the unseen God, first born before every creature." As God the Son, born of the Father before all ages, He is equal in all things to the Father . . . the substantial image of the Father . . . and equal, therefore, in sovereignty. "All creation is through Him and unto Him." He is the author and end of all created things, and therefore their King. "He again is the Head of the Body, the Church; it is He who is from the beginning, the first-born from the dead, so that among all He may stand first. For in Him it hath pleased the Father that the fullness (of the Godhead) should dwell." By virtue of the Hypostatic Union He has the fullness of the Godhead, and so is the Head of the whole Mystical Body, the Church, and holds primacy over all. "In Him we have redemption, the forgiveness of our sins. . . . In Him it hath pleased the Father that the fullness should dwell, and through Him to reconcile all things to Himself." As man He shed His blood as our ransom. By virtue of the Hypostatic Union that shedding of blood was infinite in value, and through it He ransomed all. "Christ," says Pius XI, "is our King by acquired right, for He is our Redeemer."

Christ is King of men; of all men; of those who have been baptized into the Church; of those also who are unbaptized (cf. St. Augustine in 7th *lectio* of feast).

The words of Leo XIII will be useful: "The most complete and supreme testimony of loyalty and devotion is most appropriate to Jesus Christ, the King and Lord of all things. His empire extends not only over those who profess themselves Catholics and over all the baptized, but likewise it embraces all non-Christians, so that the entire human race is really and truly under His dominion. For the only-begotten Son of the Father, who has the same substance with Him, who is 'the brightness of His glory and the figure of His substance', necessarily has all things in common with the Father, and consequently the supreme dominion over all things. . . . Inasmuch as He is the Son of the Lord of all, He is heir to universal power; hence the words 'I will give Thee the gentiles for Thine inheritance'. Similarly St. Paul says: 'Whom He hath appointed heir of all things.' . . . Nor is this all. Christ rules, not only by His innate right as the only-begotten Son of God, but also by an acquired right. For 'He hath delivered us from the power of darkness', and He also 'gave

Himself a redemption for all'. Hence not only Catholics and all baptized Christians, but all and everyone of mankind, have become His 'purchased people'. On this St. Augustine aptly remarks: 'Do you ask what He has purchased? See what He gave and you will find what He purchased. The Blood of Christ is the price. And what is worth such a price? What except the whole world? What except all nations? What He gave, He gave for all.'"

Christ is King. King of an empire; of an eternal and all-enfolding kingdom, a kingdom of truth and life, a kingdom of holiness and grace, a kingdom of justice, love, and peace (cf. Preface of feast).

But men have said: "We will not have this man to rule over us." They have enrolled themselves under false colours; under the standard of Man. Man has set himself in the place of God. Cf. Leo XIII: "From the fact that it has been the lot of reason to discover by scientific investigation many hidden and secret things of nature and to apply them seasonably to the uses of life, men are come to such a pitch of pride and arrogance as to imagine that they can dispense with God and expel His divine dominion from common life. Dupes of this error, they would transfer to human nature the sovereignty wrested from God." Man is supreme. In some cases that supremacy is openly proclaimed; in others man acts as if he were supreme. Man's law runs in international affairs, in national affairs, in economic affairs, in the constitution of the family, and the married state, in the education of the young, in private life. Authority is derived, not from God, but from man. "In the customs of life, both in public and private, no account is taken of the supremacy of the Godhead."

With what results? Consider the state of the world today, stricken with a most grave and deep disease; "morality a phantasm"; upset in international, social, economic, domestic, and private life. "Man has fallen away miserably from Jesus Christ . . . and that is the reason of the failure of all they do to repair the ills and save something from the wreck. In public affairs the foundations of authority have been swept away, by removing the primary reasons by which some have the right to rule, and others the duty of obedience. Parental authority and domestic peace have been overthrown. Sordid passion or deadly desire of gain have flared up, poisoning the fountains of life, not only of the family, but of peoples" (Pius XI). "Was there ever an age which suffered more from mental starvation, from a deeply rooted impoverishment of soul? . . . Men boasted of progress, when they were in reality relapsing into decadence; they conceived they were reaching the heights of achievement, when they were miserably forfeiting their human dignity; they claimed that this century of ours was bringing maturity and completion with it, when they were being reduced to a pitiable form of slavery" (Pius XII).

If the world is to be rescued from its present plight, men must return to God. "Men must look for the peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ" (Pius XI). "The only means by which men can be brought back into the way of salvation are reverence for Christ on His royal throne, recognition of His royal rights, and restoration both of the individual and society to the obedience which they owe to the law of Christian truth and charity" (Pius XII). "Then at last will all wounds be healed; then may right and justice hope to have again their former influence; then will the blessings of peace

be restored, the sword sheathed, and weapons fall from men's hands, when all accept and willingly obey the rule of Christ" (Leo XIII).

The recognition of the rule of Christ must begin in the individual. Each one must recognize that Christ's law must be obeyed in private life, in family life, in our dealings with our neighbours. Each must submit body, mind, and will to Christ. "It behoves all of the faithful to labour for the cause of God and of souls. . . . The times call for action, but for that action which consists in keeping the divine laws and the precepts of the Church piously and perfectly, in the free and open profession of religion, and lastly in exercising works of charity of every kind. . . . Assuredly, if in the cities, if in all the villages, the commands of God are faithfully kept, if holy things are held in honour, if the use of the Sacraments is frequent, if the other things that go to make up a Christian life are observed, there will be very little more to be done in order to restore all things in Christ" (Pius X).

Cf. Leo XIII, *Inscrutabili*, 1878 (*The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, Benziger Bros., p. 9); *Sapientiae Christianae*, 1890 (*ibid.* p. 180); *Annum sacrum*, 1899 (*ibid.* p. 454); *Tametsi*, 1900 (*ibid.* p. 462); Benedict XV, *Ad beatissimi* (A.A.S., VI, 1914, p. 565); Pius XI, *Ubi arcano* (A.A.S., 1922, XIV, p. 673); *Quas primas* (A.A.S., 1925, XVII, p. 593); *Miserentissimus Redemptor* (A.A.S., 1928, XX, p. 165); Pius XII, *Summi Pontificatus* (A.A.S., 1939, XXXI, p. 413; C.T.S., S. 151).

JOSEPH MCKENNA.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

THE first volume of Mgr. Patrick Boylan's work entitled *The Sunday Epistles and Gospels with Commentary and Suggestions for Use in Preaching* was reviewed in these columns nearly eighteen months ago,¹ and in the meantime the second volume,² which covers the Sundays from Easter to the twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost, has also appeared, thus completing an enterprise that should be of high value to all who preach. The method of treatment is exactly the same as that followed in the earlier volume, namely a translation of the text of the epistles and gospels based on the Greek, a short but very clear and adequate commentary on the extracts, and, lastly, some "Thoughts for Preaching" arising out of the matter provided by the Church's liturgical sequence. Such criticisms as have been made of this excellent "preacher's vade mecum" have, for the most part, been concerned with the alleged insufficiency of the "Thoughts"; it has been claimed, for example, that the suggestions for development of the scriptural passages are often rather obvious and unambitious. After

¹ CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XX, pp. 249-50.

² Dublin: Brown & Nolan, 1941. Pp. vi + 322. Price 8s. 6d.

considerable use of these volumes the present writer cannot endorse this opinion. It seems to him that, for those who are looking for a plain application of the literal sense, the "Thoughts" give all necessary help short of writing out the sermons at full length or tying a preacher down to a single, perhaps infelicitous, line of treatment. The writer of a work of this kind cannot be expected to cater for those who desire far-fetched or recondite interpretations which would, speaking generally, be beyond the grasp of the people to whom we ordinarily preach.

Since it may be assumed that most of the clergy already possess one or more works of this type it may be of some help to compare Mgr. Boylan's more recent book with two older books that have already been tested by the experience of at least ten years. The first is *The Epistles of the Sundays and Festivals*,¹ by the late Canon Cornelius J. Ryan, published in 1931, by M. H. Gill of Dublin as a sequel to the same author's book, *The Gospels of the Sundays and Festivals*. This is, it must be said at once, a much longer work than Mgr. Boylan's, and the commentary is in this sense much fuller than the meaning of a verse is ordinarily argued out at some length with references to numerous, though not always very recent, authorities. At the end of each Sunday's extract there is a set of "Moral Reflections" which commonly occupy three or four pages of type. A precisely similar method is adopted in Canon Ryan's earlier volumes on the Sunday Gospels. No doubt many possessors of Canon Ryan's four volumes will consider that they have all that they need, and will rejoice in the knowledge that they have a more ample commentary, more homiletic matter provided, and a treatment of the epistles and gospels for the great feasts which is wanting in Mgr. Boylan's volumes. On the other hand, it may be remarked that Canon Ryan's works are far more expensive (the pre-war price of the *Epistles* volumes alone was two guineas), and that other readers may well prefer a less leisurely and more succinct system of exegesis.

The remaining work to be considered is *A Parochial Course of Doctrinal Instructions*, a four-volume work, published at 14 dollars the set by Wagner of New York in 1921, and edited by the Dominican Fathers C. J. Callan and J. A. McHugh. This excellent compilation provides two complete sets of sermons for the Sundays and festivals, on dogmatic and moral topics respectively, each of the main sections being designed to cover the whole outline of the Church's dogmatic or moral teaching in the course of a single year. The editors explain in their preface that: "Under each Sunday and Holy day there will be found four distinct divisions: an *Outline* compiled by ourselves and based on the teachings of the Tridentine Catechism, a *Passage from the Catechism* in which the outline is developed, one or more standard modern *sermons* on the subject of the day, and many *references* to other modern and classic sermons, to St. Thomas and the theologians, to the liturgists, and to other authoritative works" (pp. x-xi). Here, as will be evident to all, there is a great deal of matter which is not to be sought in Mgr. Boylan's book or in any other work where the emphasis is mainly upon the interpretation of the epistles and gospels. Yet, conversely, the volumes of the *Parochial Course* contain little in the way of formal exegesis, and are not so well adapted as are the books already mentioned to a homiletic treatment of the extracts from Holy Scripture. As

¹ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. III, pp. 147-8.

might be expected, the sermons, though carefully chosen, vary a good deal in merit, and a considerable part of the contents (namely, the Tridentine Catechism) may readily be obtained in another and less expensive form, though it should be added that the translation here given is a great improvement on Donovan's somewhat primitive version. In conclusion, it may be said that all these works are of great value (even if they are not all equally expensive!), and that a preacher would be well advised to own, or to have access to, all three. It is sometimes remarked that one cannot have too many volumes on preaching. Here there is room for a distinction. It is all too easy to have an overflowing collection of those volumes of published sermons by writers otherwise unknown to fame which must be chiefly of service to the type of mind represented by a celebrated parson who boasted that he had never written a sermon in his life, but could *alter* one so that its own foster-father would not know it. But volumes like those by Mgr. Boylan, Canon Ryan, and Frs. Callan and McHugh are in quite a different category, and even the most experienced preacher may consult them with profit and enjoyment.

Nearly twenty years ago a Harvard professor stated in the preface to his book on St. Paul that the library of the theological school at Harvard already contained more than two thousand volumes concerned with the life and letters of St. Paul. It is an impressive figure, and one is reminded of a public meeting in a hall packed to capacity in which every newcomer is regarded as a most unwelcome intruder. Yet *St. Paul and His Letters*,¹ by the Anglican canon Anthony C. Deane, though it makes no pretension to research or originality, is no intruder but a useful addition to the not over-large collection of good, popular books on St. Paul. It ranks with such successes as the late Dr. H. N. Bate's *A Guide to the Epistles of Saint Paul*,² and Fr. Martindale's *St. Paul in the Princes of his People*³ series. Fr. Martindale, it may be remembered, wrote in his preface of "this small book which I want to help ordinary people who are not scholars, and who are not even, thank God, reading about St. Paul in order to pass an examination on him" (p. x). This is very much Canon Deane's ambition, but for two years after signing the contract he was, he tells us, unable to decide upon the exact form that the book should take. The introductory chapters on St. Paul's life and on the epistles as a whole were obvious enough, but how were the epistles to be treated individually and in a way that would appeal to readers without any devouring love of commentaries and excursions? The answer came when he was reading E. C. Wickham's edition of *Horace* and noticed the "interpretative paraphrase" prefixed to each of the epistles and satires. The method of paraphrase as applied to St. Paul is, to be sure, no new thing, as the well-known Catholic expositions by Bernardinus a Piconio and J. A. van Steenkiste so outstandingly prove. But in the case of so small a work as the present one a paraphrase has to do double duty as a running commentary and an abridgement, and it seems that, within the limits of his space, Canon Deane has been highly successful in passing over verses that have a clear sense in the existing translations, and in concentrating upon difficult passages and verses of special importance. Most

¹ London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1942. Pp. xi + 259. Price 7s. 6d. net.

² London: Longmans, 1926.

³ London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1924.

of the leading questions in special introduction are handled in a conservative sense. Thus the author vigorously defends the Pauline authorship of Ephesians and Colossians. He does not, however, accept the traditional thesis regarding the Pastorals, but considers that they contain "a number—very variously estimated—of genuine extracts from his [St. Paul's] correspondence" and that they were "considerably influenced by him throughout". The reference on p. 49 to the Mishnaic tractate *The Sayings of the Fathers* might well have been made to one or other of the modern versions by Oesterley or Danby, and not to Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. On p. 77, "Hope-Milligan" should be "Moulton-Milligan"; Moulton's first two names were "James Hope" and this is, no doubt, the explanation of the confusion.

Dr. H. H. Rowley, the professor of Semitic Languages in the University College of North Wales, has written a number of learned works, in particular *The Aramaic of the Old Testament, a grammatical and lexical study of its relations with other early Aramaic dialects*.¹ He was the author of a masterly "Introduction to the Old Testament" in *A Companion to the Bible*, a symposium edited by Dr. T. W. Manson,² and is engaged upon a grammar of Biblical Aramaic. His latest publication is a popular study entitled *The Relevance of the Bible*,³ and has, as its main divisions, chapters on the changing emphasis in Biblical studies, the inspiration of the Bible, the prophets of the Old Testament, the unity of the Bible, the use of the Bible, the God of the Bible, Sin in the thought of the Bible, and the person and work of Christ. The author's purpose in writing his book is declared in the first sentence of his preface: "That the Bible is relevant to our modern world which so largely ignores it, and that modern scholarship is not inimical to the spiritual understanding and use of the Bible." It is not, and does not claim to be, a complete manual of Biblical theology; certain topics are selected and others are ignored. A Catholic would certainly have written many of its pages in a wholly different manner and would, in particular, have given a more satisfying account of Biblical inspiration. Yet those familiar with Old Testament criticism will probably agree with the author in his remark that: "Theologically I find myself much more conservative than I used to think I was." Certainly there is much that is excellent in the author's account of the mission of Israel's prophets, the unity of the two Covenants, the Biblical conception of sin, and the redeeming power of the Cross. Concerning God in the Bible he rightly maintains that: "The God of the Bible is a loving God. This is true of the Old Testament as well as the New. I have heard sermons which have contrasted the God of the New Testament as a loving God with the God of the Old Testament as a severe God. They have displayed understanding neither of the Old Testament, nor of the meaning of love" (p. 129). Yet such misunderstandings are not confined to pulpit orators, and it was a German Catholic scholar, Dr. Joseph Ziegler, who most successfully combated what is a radically false view of God in the Old Testament in his work *Die Liebe Gottes bei den Propheten*.⁴ In a future edition Professor

¹ Oxford University Press, 1929.

² Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XX, pp. 246-8.

³ London: James Clarke, 1942. Pp. viii + 192. Price 6s. net.

⁴ Münster i.W., 1930.

Rowley might correct his account of the Council of Trent's decree on the authenticity of the Vulgate. In its present form it might be understood to imply that a Catholic could not legitimately consult, or quote as authoritative, the original texts or the other ancient versions in addition to *haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio*.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

REGISTRATION OF BAPTISM

A child whose parents are domiciled in parish "A" is born in a nursing home in parish "B" and baptised in the nearest church, which is that of parish "C". In which parish register should the entry be made? (W. A.)

REPLY

Canon 90, §1: *Locus originis filii . . . est ille in quo, cum filius natus est, domicilium, aut, in defectu domicilii, quasi-domicilium habebat pater vel, si filius sit illegitimus aut postumus, mater.*

Canon 778: *Si baptismus nec a proprio parochi nec eo praesente administratus fuerit, minister de ipso collato quamprimum proprium ratione domicilii parochum baptizati certiore reddat.*

S.C. de Disciplina Sacramentorum, 29 June, 1941, n. 11, d.: *Pervigilent vero ut baptismus fortassis extra paroeciam originis collatus, praeter quam in renatorum regesto paroeciae . . . ubi quis reapse eum suscepit, scripto item consignetur libris paroeciae originis. Ad rem quam primum per parochum vel rectorem ecclesiae collati baptismi tradendus est ad rectorem paroeciae originis nuncius scriptus, qui fideliter omnia et singula elementa complectatur quae ad baptismi actum rite conficiendum iure (can. 777) requiruntur.* Cf. *CLERGY REVIEW*, 1941, XXI, p. 206.

It has always been necessary to inform the parish priest of the candidate's place of origin whenever baptism was administered elsewhere, but it was not certain before the recent Instruction, 29 June, 1941, whether the entry was to be made in the register of the parish of origin. A private reply, *S.C. Conc.*, 31 January, 1927, quoted by Fr. Dunne in *The Ritual Explained*, 5th edition, p. 16, seems to direct that registration in the parish of origin is not necessary.

The procedure is now quite clear. In the above case the child is rightly baptised by the parish priest of "C" from canon 738, §2; he must enter the details in his own register and, in addition, send these details to the parish priest of "A"; the parish priest of "A" must enter them in his own register.

FORM OF STATUE B.V.M.

It is alleged that a recent decision of the "Canon Law Department" in Rome forbids statues of Our Lady and Child representing Our Lady as crowned or seated unless Our Lord is similarly represented. Is this so? (A.)

REPLY

Canon 1279, §1 : Nemini liceat in ecclesiis, etiam exemptis, aliisve locis sacris ullam insolitam ponere vel ponendam curare imaginem, nisi ab Ordinario loci sit approbata.

We can find no trace of any Roman instruction of the kind described, and the nomination of its source leads us rather to suppose that it is nothing more than the opinion of some private teacher. If any of our readers have any information about it we should be glad to have the text of this Roman document.

In the meantime it is certain that statues of the type alleged to be forbidden are very common, and we can see no reason against them. Both at St. Edmund's and at Ampleforth Our Lady (holding the divine Infant) is alone crowned; several examples of this and of Our Lady alone seated may be seen in Dom Roulin's *Nos Eglises*, and one well-known figure, produced by Burns Oates & Washbourne, is described in this book (Fig. 754) as "Rien d'insolite, ni de vulgaire, ni de bizarre."

NUPTIAL MASS

A parish priest, for his own convenience, prefers to give the nuptial blessing *extra Missam*, and the parties are only vaguely aware of their right to a nuptial Mass. Are they entitled to it on a subsequent day, if they so desire, even though the nuptial blessing *extra Missam* has already been received? (A.)

REPLY

Canon 1101, §1 : Parochus curet ut sponsi benedictionem sollemnem accipiant, quae dari eis potest etiam postquam diu vixerint in matrimonio, sed solum in Missa, servata speciali rubrica et excepto tempore feriato. Cf. also *Rit. Rom.*, tit. vii, c. 1, n. 16.

Canon 1143 : Mulier cui semel benedictio sollemnis data sit, nequit in subsequentibus nuptiis eam iterum accipere.

Addit. et Variat in Rubr. Missalis II, n. 2 : Haec porro benedictio nunquam dari potest . . . si uterque aut alteruter alias benedictionem acceperit. . . .

(1) Notwithstanding the indult or custom in this country of giving the nuptial blessing *extra Missam*, discussed in this REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 227, we think it is certain that parties who ask for a nuptial Mass are entitled

to have it; it is the common law and persons are not bound to use an indult, which is a privilege, unless they so desire; cf. canon 69. A priest may not refuse a nuptial Mass unless the request is unreasonable, e.g. if it is desired at a time which is gravely inconvenient. He acts in accordance with the whole spirit of the liturgy by urging the faithful to be married with a nuptial Mass, but he cannot be accused of a breach of duty in not persuading them, unless local law places this obligation upon him, as it does, for example, in the Liverpool Synod, XXII (1934), n. 164. For he could maintain, with great plausibility, that the indult is partly for his own benefit, and that he intends to avail himself of it.

(ii) The nuptial blessing may be received only once; it was received *extra Missam* in the above case and may not, therefore, be repeated. We cannot find any writer who discusses this point, but it seems quite obvious that if it may not be repeated in a subsequent marriage it is *a fortiori* unlawful to give it twice in the same marriage. It is also against the rubrics to celebrate the votive Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa*, even on days when any votive Mass is permitted, unless the nuptial blessing is to be given during the Mass. This may be deduced from the directions printed in the Missal before the Introit, and is noted by all the writers, e.g. O'Connell, *The Celebration of Mass*, I, p. 91; De Smet, *De Matrimonio*, §197; Payen, *De Matrimonio*, §1874. The parties in the above case may have Mass said for their intention, but inasmuch as they cannot receive the nuptial blessing, it will differ in no way from any other Mass at which the faithful may assist.

DOMICILE

A man, aged 22, joins the Army from the house of his parents where he was born. The parents die and the house is taken by strangers. When on leave the soldier stays with a relative in another parish of the same diocese and has no intention of returning to the parish of his deceased parents. Has he a diocesan domicile? Has he a quasi-domicile in the parish where he spends his leave? (A. B.)

REPLY

Canon 92, §1. Domicilium acquiritur commoratione in aliqua paroecia aut quasi-paroecia, aut saltem in dioecesi . . . quae commoratio vel coniuncta sit cum animo ibi perpetuo manendi, si nihil inde avocet, vel sit reapse protracta ad decennium completum.

§2. Quasi-domicilium acquiritur commoratione uti supra, quae vel coniuncta sit cum animo ibi manendi saltem ad maiorem anni partem, si nihil inde avocet, vel sit reapse protracta ad maiorem anni partem.

Canon 95. Domicilium et quasi-domicilium amittitur discessione a loco cum animo non revertendi.

Since the condition of being without a domicile or quasi-domicile is a legal disadvantage, a person is not deemed to have put himself in this condition unless it is quite certain that he has abandoned whatever dwelling

he used to have and that he has not acquired a fresh one. It is evident, in the above case, that the man retains his diocesan domicile. The parochial domicile of his parents became his own domicile when he reached the age of twenty-one, but he has relinquished it by departing with the intention of not returning. The only question, therefore, is whether he has not only a diocesan domicile but a parochial one in the place where he spends his leave.

Two elements determine the acquisition of domicile or quasi-domicile. The first is personal and physical residence, not necessarily in one's own house—a hotel or a friend's house suffices. The second element, the intention of remaining, is not always easily verifiable, unless the person has expressly declared his mind; but it can be deduced or presumed from the fact, for example, that his possessions have been transferred to the place of residence. Moreover, the intention of remaining permanently (domicile) or for six months (quasi-domicile) is quite consistent with actually departing for the purpose of business or study or amusement or, as in our case, of serving in the Army, provided always there is the intention of returning. Thus, from canon 956, a candidate for Holy Orders can acquire a domicile in his future diocese even though he departs thence to continue his studies elsewhere.

In our view, accordingly, the man is presumed to have a parochial domicile with his relative; but the matter could be put beyond all dispute by a declaration of his intention.

ACT OF CONTRITION DURING ABSOLUTION

Is it necessary for the penitent to make an act of contrition whilst absolution is being pronounced? If not necessary, is it important? (K.)

REPLY

Roman Ritual, Tit. iii, cap. i, n. 1: "illius quidem remota materia sunt peccata, proxima vero sunt actus poenitentis, nempe contritio, confessio et satisfactio."

Ibid. n. 18: "Demum, audita confessione . . . ad dolorem et contritionem efficacibus verbis adducere conabitur . . ."

(i) By "necessary" in the above question we understand "essential for the validity of absolution". The act of contrition must necessarily precede absolution and be related to it at least virtually and implicitly; it is on this assumption that an unconscious person may be absolved. But it is taught by all that it is not necessary for the validity of the sacrament that the penitent should verbally or mentally make an act of contrition in the confessional, either immediately after the confession of sin and before absolution, or whilst absolution is being pronounced. The kind of simultaneity between the matter and form, required for the unity of the sacramental sign in other sacraments, is not necessary in the sacrament of Penance which has been instituted in the form of a judgement; there is nothing in

the form of a judgement which requires the admission of guilt to accompany the sentence, or even to be made in the place where judgement is given and immediately preceding it. It suffices if it precedes the judgement and is related to it. Thus a person making an act of contrition over-night and determining to go to confession the next morning is validly absolved without an actual renewal of sorrow at the time; it is present virtually in the act of seeking or accepting absolution. Cf. Gougnard, *De Poenitentia* (1939), p. 102; Prümmer, *Theologia Moralís*, III, n. 350.

Normally, whenever a person thinks of his sins and resolves to confess them he also makes an act of contrition, but it is strongly recommended that all penitents should explicitly make this act before entering the confessional; otherwise, owing to mental wandering or distraction, it may be omitted, perhaps, at the moment of absolution or immediately preceding it, and a necessary part of the matter of the sacrament may be lacking.

(ii) The Ritual directs the confessor, after hearing a confession, to stir up sorrow in the penitent, and confessors usually observe this rubric by at least saying: "Make a good act of contrition and I will give you absolution." Accordingly, the practice of explicitly renewing one's sorrow at this time is rightly insisted upon, and children are always taught to do so when being prepared for their first confession, even though it is not necessary for the validity of the absolution if it has been done before entering the confessional. The practice should certainly continue because the rubric requires it, the penitent is thereby better disposed for receiving sacramental grace, and certainty is obtained that this necessary act of the penitent has preceded absolution.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENT

PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION

Letter addressed to their Excellencies the Archbishops and Bishops of Italy.¹ (*Continued.*)

(2) *On the Use of the Vulgate.* Even more palpable is the error of the anonymous writer regarding the meaning and the ambit of the Tridentine decree on the use of the Latin Vulgate. The Council of Trent, to remedy the confusion occasioned by the new translations then current in Latin and in vernacular languages, wished to confirm the public use, as regards the Western Church, of the common Latin version, and justified its action

¹ Translated from the original Italian, with commentary, by V. Rev. Mgr. John M. T. Barton, D.D., L.S.S.

by referring to the age-long use made of the version in that Church. I did not, however, for one moment think of lessening the authority of the ancient versions employed in the Eastern Churches, notably the Septuagint version used by the apostles themselves, and still less was there any thought of diminishing the authority of the original texts. The Council resisted a group of Fathers which wished to impose the exclusive use of the Vulgate as the only authoritative text. Yet the anonymous writer considers that in virtue of the Tridentine decree, we possess in the Latin version a text declared superior to all others, and he taunts Catholic exegetes with their desire to interpret the Vulgate with the help of the original texts and of the other ancient versions. For him the decree gives us such "certainty regarding the sacred text" that the Church has no need to "seek further the authentic word of God" (p. 7), and this applies not only *in rebus fidei et morum* but in every respect (even in questions of literature, geography, chronology, etc.). The Church by that decree has given us "the authentic and official text from which one may not lawfully depart" (p. 6), and in consequence the work of textual criticism is "a mutilation of Holy Scripture" (p. 8) and "a presumptuous usurpation of the authority [of the Church] which alone can present us with an authentic text, and which alone has, in fact, given such a text to us by the aforementioned decree of the Council of Trent" (p. 28). All critical examination of the Biblical text, as presented to us in the Vulgate, is "an act of private interpretation, say rather crazy private interpretation, taking the place of the authority of the Church" (p. 9).

Now, in fact, a contention of this kind is contrary not only to common sense, which would never accept the view that a version could be superior to the original texts, but to the mind of the Fathers of the Council as it appears from the Acts. The Council was fully aware that the Vulgate itself stood in need of revision and correction, and it committed the execution of the task to the Supreme Pontiffs. This wish of the Council the Popes proceeded to accomplish, as they also carried out, according to the mind of the Council's most authoritative collaborators, a corrected edition of the Septuagint (in the reign of Sixtus V). Further, they commanded similar revisions of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament to be made, and set up commissions expressly for that purpose. Again, the author's claim is in open contradiction with the ruling of the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*: "Neque tamen non sua habenda erit ratio reliquarum versionum, quas christiana laudavit usurpavitque antiquitas, maxime codicum primigeniorum" (*Ench. Bibl.*, n. 91).

In fine, the Council of Trent declares the Vulgate to be "authentic" in a juridical sense, that is as regards its "vis probativa in rebus fidei et morum", but it does not entirely exclude possible divergences from the original text and the ancient versions, as every good manual of scriptural introduction clearly explains in accordance with the Acts of the same Council.

Comment. The anonymous writer's attempt to exalt the Vulgate at the expense of the originals and the other versions is on a par with his wholehearted ignorance of textual criticism, and is perhaps a direct result of that ignorance. It has, at any rate, a very old-fashioned air at the present day. For many readers of the letter the most interesting paragraph will be the last, in which the Commission gives an authoritative ruling on a point

that once excited much controversy—namely, whether the decree of Trent on the Vulgate's authenticity is to be interpreted as formally dogmatic, or as formally disciplinary and fundamentally dogmatic. (On this point Bañez wrote with great caution: "Scio quidem si ab Ecclesia interrogarer, quid viva voce responderem: interim pio justoque silentio me contineo." In *Iam paritem*, q. 1, a. 8 ap. Vosté, op. cit. infr., p. 22). Again, is the authenticity mentioned to be explained in terms of internal conformity with the original text, in the sense that the Vulgate is a perfect translation? Or is it to be interpreted as juridical authenticity, giving it an official character in the Latin Church? The question is most ably and clearly discussed by the present Secretary of the Commission, Père J. M. Vosté, O.P., in his brochure *De Latina Bibliorum Versione quae dicitur Vulgata*, Rome, Desclée, 1927, pp. 19–28. The Commission's answer is short but quite decisive.

(3) *On the science of textual criticism.* Given his conception, explained above, of the all but unique value of the Vulgate, and of the very slight or almost non-existent service rendered by the original texts and the other ancient versions, it is not astonishing that the anonymous author denies the necessity and usefulness of textual criticism, and this notwithstanding the fact that recent discoveries of priceless texts have confirmed the contrary opinion. Since "it is the Church that presents the sacred text to us and guarantees it" (p. 10), the science of textual criticism means "treating the divine Book as though it were a human book" (p. 23); the sole use that can be made of the original text and the ancient versions is to *consult* them "in the case of certain difficulties where enlightenment is needed" (p. 6). The Greek text cannot have "force of proof" against another text or "against the Church's own official text" (p. 8), nor "may entire passages or verses be in any way *expunged* from the text, whether that of the Church [i.e. the Vulgate] or of the original" (p. 7); not even, therefore, those which are wanting in the earliest recensions of the text and have subsequently crept into it. To attempt to establish the sacred text by means of criticism is to "massacre" the Bible (p. 9). Hence there are some pages of the brochure full of invective against "scientific criticism", "naturalism", and "modernism".

Catholic Biblical study, from the time of Origen and St. Jerome down to the setting up of the "Commission for the revision and emendation of the Vulgate" by the very Pope who issued the Encyclical *Pascendi*, has laboured to establish the purest possible form of the original text and of the versions including (not to say in the first place) the Vulgate. Leo XIII strongly recommends: "Artis criticae disciplinam, quippe percipiendae penitus hagiographorum sententiae perutilem, Nobis vehementer probantibus, nostri excolant. Hanc ipsam facultatem, adhibita loco ope heterodoxorum, Nobis non repugnantibus, iidem exacuant" (Apostolic Letter *Vigilantiae*, *Ench. Bibl.*, n. 135). Further, the Pontifical Biblical Commission made answer that in the Pentateuch (and "servatis servandis" also in other books of the Bible: cf. the decree *De Psalmis*, *Ench. Bibl.*, n. 345) it might be admitted that: "Tam longo saeculorum decursu nonnullas . . . modificationes obvenisse, uti: additamenta post Moysi mortem vel ab auctore inspirato apposita, vel glossas et explicationes textui interjectas; vocabula quaedam et formas e sermone antiquato in sermonem recentiorem translatas: mendosas demum lectiones vitio amanuensium adscribendas, de quibus fas sit ad normas artis criticae disquirere et judicare" (Decree *De Mosaica authentia Pentateuchi* of 27 June, 1906. Cf. *Ench. Bibl.*, n. 177). Finally, the Holy Office permitted, and still permits, Catholic

exegetes to discuss the question of the *Comma Joanneum*, and "argumentis hinc inde accurate perpensis, cum ea, quam rei gravitas requirit, moderatione et temperantia, in sententiam genuinitati contrariam inclinare" (Declaration of the Holy Office, 2 June, 1927, *Ench. Bibl.*, n. 121). All this is forgotten or glossed over by the author of the present brochure in order to bring into disrepute the work of Catholic exegetes who, faithful to Catholic traditions and to the guiding principles of the supreme ecclesiastical authority, prove by the very fact of their rigorous and consuming labours in textual criticism how great is their respect for the sacred text.

Comment. It is unnecessary to add much to the arguments put forward in this section of the letter. Textual criticism stands in little need of defence. It is only to be regretted that there are not more Catholic textual critics, at any rate in this country; a high proportion of the best criticism of this type is in the hands of non-Catholics. The publication in 1935 of Père M. J. Lagrange's *Critique textuelle: II La Critique rationnelle* was an outstanding event in the history of Catholic textual criticism, and the New Testament texts edited by Prof H. J. Vogels and P. August Merk, S.J., are, doubtless, an earnest of future work by Catholic scholars on equally sound lines.

(To be concluded)

BOOK REVIEWS

The Priest's Prayer Book. A Handbook to the Breviary. By Rev. C. J. Wilmot, S.J. Pp. 146. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1942. 7s. 6d.)

THE sub-title of this little book is perhaps liable to be misunderstood, since by "manual" or "handbook" we usually mean something which, however brief it may be, does cover the whole subject. A more exact sub-title would be "An Explanation of the Dominical Psalms". With the aid of established commentaries on the psalms such as Vander Heeren's *Psalmi et Cantica explicata in ordine ad recitationem Breviarii*, and Martindale's *Sweet Singer in Israel*, Fr. Wilmot gives us in parallel columns the Latin text and an English version, the latter further explained, where necessary, by a bracketed paraphrase. Thus Psalm cxviii, v. 11: "The words of Thy law I have treasured up in my heart that I may not sin against Thee (*God's law remembered is a safeguard against sin*)". In addition, each psalm has an introductory commentary on the whole piece, which is probably the most valuable part of Fr. Wilmot's book.

Interspersed throughout the text are a number of meditations on priestly life and obligations which many, besides the members of the Apostolic Union to whom they were first addressed, may be glad to have. They are simple and direct, having some connection—though this is not always very obvious—with the psalm that has preceded. Thus in Psalm cxii, v. 2, "Sit nomen Domini benedictum" offers the occasion for some useful advice on public speaking and on the correct way of pronouncing

such words as "movement" (not *movemunt*) or "window" (not *winder*); or, since it is consoling at night to remember that the day has been spent in works of charity, the first psalm of Compline is followed by a meditation on charity. These meditations, though unequal in value and originality, are all of a practical character, and show that the author is well acquainted with the difficulties of a priest's life.

E. J. M.

Pontifical Ceremonies. By Rev. P. Ahearne and Rev. M. Lane. Pp. 359. (Burns Oates & Washbourné, 1942. 15s.)

SYDNEY SMITH, in one of his letters to an Archdeacon, says that "what bishops like best in their clergy is a dropping-down-deadness of manner"; he was writing, of course, about non-Catholics. The reverse is true of a Catholic prelate: what he likes best at a pontifical ceremony is to have a team of ministers and servers who are very much alive, having well studied and prepared their respective duties. This book, with its descriptions, diagrams and lists, will enable them all to acquit themselves with distinction.

The joint authors, professors at St. John's College, Waterford, give a careful and accurate explanation of the principal episcopal ceremonies of the Roman Rite: the various kinds of pontifical Mass; the ceremonies of Holy Week; the rite of Visitation and Confirmation; finally, certain blessings from the Roman Pontifical. The writers are evidently very competent in this particular branch of ceremonial, and they have presented the subject in a style and manner which the clergy will find most acceptable on the rare and harassing occasions when a pontifical ceremony takes place in a parish church.

The work does not claim to deal with every episcopal ceremony: the long and involved rite of consecrating a church, for example, is very properly omitted. But, even at the sacrifice of some pages of the text explaining Holy Week ceremonies, which are usually restricted to cathedral churches, room might have been found, perhaps, for the rite of consecrating an altar, which not infrequently occurs in parish churches; also some account of the *Ordo Exequiarum* might usefully have been added to the pages describing a pontifical Requiem. On the whole, the authors have made a very judicious selection of rites, and the book should be in the sacristy of every church.

It inevitably invites comparison with Fr. O'Connell's three volumes on the *Celebration of Mass* issued by the same publishing house, a notable feature of which is the copious reference to rubrics and decrees justifying nearly every statement contained in them. The joint authors of *Pontifical Ceremonies* prefer instead to refer the reader, where necessary, to the writings of commentators, and there is, no doubt, an adequate reason for their method; the footnotes are also very largely a glossary or amplification of the text. We believe that Fr. O'Connell's method is not only more thorough and scientific, but will probably assure for his works a longer life. In addition it must be said that, though the printing and production of *Pontifical Ceremonies* are extremely good, especially for war-time, they are not quite up to the high standard and style of Fr. O'Connell's three volumes.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

TRIPLEX MACHINA

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 330)

"Latrans" writes :

May I offer an observation supplemental to the informative note on the *triplex machina* of the hymnographers?

In the hymn for Matins, *Comm. Fest. B.V.M.*, the resemblance of strophes 1 and 3 to Isaias xl, 12, is so close as hardly to be the result of a coincidence. The texts are as follows :

- (1) Quem terra, pontus, sidera (*v.l.* aethera)
Colunt, adorant, praedicant,
Trinam regentem machinam
Clastrum Mariae baiulat.

Mundum pugillo continens
Ventris sub arca clausus est.

- (2) Quis mensus est pugillo aquas, et caelos palmo ponderavit? Quis appendit tribus digitis molem terrae et libravit in pondere montes et colles in statera?" (Is. l.c., Vulgate).

Thus we have :

In Hymn	In Isaias
<i>terra</i>	= <i>molem terrae</i>
<i>pontus</i>	= <i>aquas</i>
<i>sidera</i> (or : <i>aethera</i>)	= <i>caelos</i>
<i>mundum pugillo continens</i>	= <i>mensus est pugillo</i> (also : <i>palmò ponderavit, appendit tribus digitis</i>).

If, as seems clear, the Hymn depends to some extent on Isaias, then the *trina machina* is not (directly, at any rate) that of Lucretius, etc., but of Gen. i, which Isaias has in mind here, and which is repeated so frequently throughout the Old Testament : Heavens (or Firmament), Earth, and (as your contributor suggests for *pontus*) the Deep (*tehom*, the Primal Ocean or Abyss). To equate this *machina* with that of Lucretius, of Phil. ii, 10, etc. (Heavens, Earth, and *Underworld of the Dead*), would involve a discussion of the relations between *tehom* (the Abyss) and *sheol* (the Underworld), as conceived by the Hebrews. See e.g. Kissane on Job xxvi, 5, 6 (*Comm. on Job*, Dublin, 1939, p. 197); and, for another view, Whitehouse in *Hastings' Dict. of Bible*, s.v. *Cosmogony*.

[Other correspondence is held over.—Ed.]

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM